



625









CORRESPONDENCE OF  
JOHN HENRY NEWMAN WITH JOHN  
KEBLE AND OTHERS . . . 1839-1845





CORRESPONDENCE OF  
JOHN HENRY NEWMAN  
WITH JOHN KEBLE  
AND OTHERS . . . 1839-1845

EDITED AT  
THE BIRMINGHAM ORATORY

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.  
39 PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON  
FOURTH AVENUE & 30TH STREET, NEW YORK  
BOMBAY, CALCUTTA, AND MADRAS

1917

*All rights reserved*

**NIHIL OBSTAT**

**CAROLUS J. CRONIN, S.T.D.**

*Censor Deputatus.*

*Die 7 Augusti, 1917.*

Cum opus cui titulus: "Correspondence of John Henry Newman, etc. 1839-1845," a Censore a Nobis deputato rite recognitum et approbatum fuerit, Nos illud praelo dignum judicamus.

**DATUM BIRMINGAMIAE**

*die 8 Augusti, 1917.*

**✠ EDUARDUS ARCHIEP. BIRMINGAMIEN.**

**IMPRIMATUR**

**EDM. CAN. SURMONT**

*Vic. Gen.*

**WESTMONASTERII**

*die 11 Augusti, 1917.*

## PREFACE

A FEW months after the death of Cardinal Newman in 1890 his 'Letters and Correspondence during his Life in the English Church' (1801-1845) were edited by his sister-in-law, Miss Anne Mozley. The present volume is a further selection from the last six years of the same correspondence. It consists of letters which, with a small number of exceptions, were not published by Miss Mozley. The chief exceptions are some three or four letters from Newman to Mr. Bowden written in 1840, and about the same number belonging to the correspondence between Newman and Keble during the years 1843-1845. These latter have been included in order that the reader may have before him the whole of the correspondence of which they are a part. The letters to Mr. Bowden were almost indispensable because of the events which they describe. The choice practically lay between reprinting them and giving a summary of their contents. Some passages in them which were omitted by Miss Mozley, and are not without interest, have been supplied.

The reader will hardly need to be reminded of the fullness of the last six years of Newman's life in the English Church, and their anguish. During the summer and autumn of 1839, when he was studying the history of the Monophysite controversy in the fifth century, he began to discern 'an awful similitude, more awful because so silent and unimpassioned, between the dead records of the past and the feverish chronicle of the present.' It was in this way, and from this most unlikely quarter, that his first doubts concerning the tenability of his Anglican position crept upon him. He was startled and dismayed, but there could be no question of succumbing at once. His doubts might vanish as suddenly as they had come. Time alone could show whether they

were a conviction of the intellect or an obsession of the imagination.

Meanwhile others were beginning to have their doubts and difficulties, one of which was how to reconcile subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles with the profession of Catholic principles. To meet this difficulty, which for his own part he did not feel, Newman published in 1841 Tract 90. The storm which this Tract raised took him by surprise, but he weathered it fairly well. If anything, it probably helped him, by distracting his mind from the thought of his own difficulties. As for the Tract, he was quite satisfied with the position which he defended in it, and was content if it escaped episcopal censure. This latter point, trusting to an informal 'understanding,' he thought he had secured by his 'Letter to the Bishop of Oxford.' It was, therefore, with a mind at ease that he took refuge in his books from the turmoil around him and set to work at translating St. Athanasius for the Oxford Library of the Fathers.

Now came a succession of blows which fairly broke him. The chief among these were (1) the Jerusalem Bishopric scheme, and the contrast between the calmness with which the Church of England endured this public proclamation of her homogeneity with foreign Protestantism and the outcry against Tract 90; (2) the charges fulminated against Tract 90; and, worst of all, (3) St. Athanasius and the history of the Arian controversy which brought to life again the doubt that had assailed him in the summer and autumn of 1839. Then—*foris pugnae: intus timores*—followed the dreary years of spiteful attacks from without and ever-increasing doubts from within, while he lay, as he afterwards described it, on his death-bed as regards his membership with the Anglican communion. In the spring of 1843 he could no longer doubt that he doubted, and he sought counsel from Keble. In the autumn of the same year he completed the process of self-effacement, which he had begun after the condemnation of Tract 90, by resigning St. Mary's. The autumn of 1844 was *the dark night of his soul*, into which hardly any ray of comfort seems to have penetrated. His

mind was full of the thoughts of the unhappiness he was causing his friends, of the great work which he was undoing, and of the unsettlement and despair of discovering religious truth which would come over the minds of many. He did not expect to have a large following, but he feared much that great numbers, instead of standing where they were, would gradually sink back to the level from which he had raised them. The end came in October 1845, sooner than he had anticipated. At one time he had thought of allowing a full seven years to pass from the beginning of his doubts before he came to a decision. Then he proposed to complete his 'Essay on Development.' But the power to hold his judgment in suspense had practically parted from him, so clearly did reason and conscience now speak.

The editorial matter is intended to serve as a kind of historical framework of the letters. For the convenience of the reader it has been made distinguishable at a glance from them by being printed in closer lines. The amount of it may appear excessive to persons already familiar with the history of the Tractarian Movement, but this history is rapidly becoming ancient history, and the knowledge of it on the part of the general reader which could have been assumed twenty-five or thirty years ago can no longer be taken as a matter of course. Letters are most precious memorials of the past. It lives in them as it does in no other kind of record or monument. This is their charm. But the knowledge necessary in order to feel it, is very rarely contained in them. They were not intended for posterity to the end that *it may know*, and do not rehearse for its benefit matters familiar to every one at the time when they were being written. One need not go very far for an illustration. The letters connected with Tract 90 in the present volume will serve the purpose admirably. For those who bring to them some knowledge of the contents and history of this famous Tract they make the excitement which it caused almost contagious. But they do not supply this necessary preliminary knowledge without which reading them is like witnessing a play in an unknown language. The finest

display of emotion and feeling soon becomes wearisome when the spectator does not know what it all turns upon. It is a truism, almost too obvious to be uttered, that those gain most from the letters and correspondence of a bygone age who have least to learn from them in the shape of actual facts.

The Editors desire to record with thanks their appreciation of the courtesy extended to them by the following persons : To Mrs. Thomas Keble and the Rev. Dr. Lock, Warden of Keble College, for permission to use the valuable collection of letters written by Keble to Newman. They are, further, indebted to Dr. Lock for his kindness in correcting the proofs of these letters, the originals of which were deposited by Newman in the library of Keble College. To Miss Mary Church for permission to use two letters by her father the late Dean Church of St. Paul's ; to Mr. J. C. Moberly for a letter by Bishop Moberly of Salisbury ; to Mrs. Albert Croly for a letter by Dr. James Henthorn Todd ; to the Rev. Lewis R. C. Bagot for letters by Bishop Bagot of Oxford ; to the present Bishop of Oxford and the Rev. Canon J. O. Johnston for letter by Dr. Pusey ; to Miss Caroline S. Landon for a letter by the Rev. Arthur Perceval ; to the Rev. Canon Wyndham for letters by Cardinal Manning ; to Mr. R. E. Froude for a letter by his mother, Mrs. William Froude ; to Mr. J. R. Mozley for a letter by the Rev. Thomas Mozley, and much valuable information besides ; to the family and literary representatives of Dr. Russell of Maynooth for letters by Dr. Russell ; to Mr. E. C. Hawkins for a letter by his grandfather, Dr. Hawkins of Oriel ; to Bishop Hook and to Messrs. Macmillan and Co., Ltd., for letters by Dean Hook ; and to Mr. John Murray for extracts made from the ' Life of Bishop Wilberforce,' and from the ' Letters of Frederic, Lord Blachford.'

For any acknowledgment which may be wanting, the Editors rely upon the indulgence of those whose names have been omitted, whether through inadvertence or from the difficulty, after the lapse of so many years, of identifying them.

## CONTENTS

CHAP	PAGE.
I. THE SUMMER OF 1839 . . . . .	I
II. THE NEW SCHOOL OF TRACTARIANS . . . . .	27
III. TRACT XC. JANUARY TO APRIL 1841 . . . . .	70
IV. DR. RUSSELL AND NEWMAN, 1841 . . . . .	111
V. THE JERUSALEM BISHOPRIC, 1841 . . . . .	133
VI. INCREASING DIFFICULTIES, 1842 . . . . .	165
VII. RESIGNATION OF ST. MARY'S, 1843 . . . . .	202
VIII. IN RETIREMENT . . . . .	294
IX. THE END . . . . .	365
APPENDIX . . . . .	393
INDEX . . . . .	397





CORRESPONDENCE OF  
JOHN HENRY NEWMAN  
WITH JOHN KEBLE AND OTHERS  
1839-1845

CHAPTER I

THE SUMMER OF 1839

'Is there anything whereof it may be said, See, this is new? It hath been already of old time, which was before us.'—*Eccles. i. 10.*

IN the summer of 1839 Newman took advantage of the quiet of the Long Vacation to study the history of the Monophysite controversy. Things were going remarkably well with him just then. 'I had,' he says, 'supreme confidence in my controversial *status*, and I had a great and still growing success in recommending it to others.'<sup>1</sup> His controversial *status* was the Anglican Via Media with its appeal to antiquity against Rome on the one side, and Protestantism on the other.

There are stories of haunted places where some tragedy of the past is being constantly re-enacted after a ghostly fashion in the present. The exact opposite of this happened to Newman. He plunged into the past and encountered the spectre of the present 'like a spirit rising from the troubled waters of the old world, with the shape and lineaments of the new.'<sup>2</sup>

This is how he describes his amazement and disgust:—

'My stronghold was Antiquity; now here in the middle of the fifth century, I found, as it seemed to me, Christendom of the sixteenth and nineteenth centuries reflected. I saw my face in that mirror, and I was a Monophysite. The

<sup>1</sup> *Apologia*, p. 93.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 115.

Church of the Via Media was in the position of the Oriental communion, Rome was where she now is; and the Protestants were the Eutychians.'<sup>1</sup>

And again :—

'It was difficult to make out how the Eutychians or Monophysites were heretics, unless Protestants and Anglicans were heretics also; difficult to find arguments against the Tridentine Fathers, which did not tell against the Fathers of Chalcedon; difficult to condemn the Popes of the sixteenth century, without condemning the Popes of the fifth. The drama of religion, and the combat of truth and error, were ever one and the same.'<sup>2</sup>

It seems a strange thing to insert a piece of fifth-century church history into a volume of nineteenth-century letters; but it is not stranger than the facts which practically dictate such a procedure. 'Of all passages of history, since history has been, who would have thought of going to the sayings and doings of old Eutyches, that *delirus senex* as, I think, Petavius calls him, and to the enormities of the unprincipled Dioscorus, in order to be converted to Rome?'<sup>3</sup> But as this is what actually happened in the case of Newman, it is to Eutyches and Dioscorus that they must go who wish to enter into his feelings and reasonings during the years 1839–1845; and they must try to realise these two worthies as vividly as they realise the Heads of Colleges who condemned Tract XC, or the bishops who wrote charges against it. The ancients supplied a text and the moderns provided it with a commentary.

In A.D. 448 Eutyches, the abbot of a monastery in the suburbs of Constantinople, was condemned by a synod held in that city, and presided over by St. Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, for teaching the doctrine of One, not Two, Natures in Christ. Eutyches was a *persona grata* at court, and St. Flavian was not. In consequence the affair soon became one of the first magnitude, and the Emperor, Theodosius II, determined upon a General Council to settle it. Meanwhile both the Emperor and Eutyches wrote to the Pope, St. Leo the Great, but no report came from St. Flavian. The Pope wrote somewhat sharply to the last-named. It was from him that he ought first to have heard of the scandal, and it was not clear that Eutyches

<sup>1</sup> *Apologia*, p. 114.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 115.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* p. 114.

had been justly condemned. 'Send therefore,' the letter continued, 'to give us a full account of what has occurred.' On hearing from St. Flavian, the Pope, now fully informed, wrote his *Epistola Dogmatica ad Flavianum*, generally known as the Tome of St. Leo, in which Eutyches was condemned, and the Catholic doctrine of the Two Natures was set forth.

St. Leo somewhat reluctantly acceded to the Emperor's proposal of a General Council, and agreed to be represented at it by legates. These were furnished with very definite instructions which they were to deliver to the assembled bishops. The Council met at Ephesus in August A.D. 449. Dioscorus, Patriarch of Alexandria, presided, and carried everything before him. The legates were not refused a hearing point-blank; but it was contrived that it should never be the opportune moment for them to speak and deliver their instructions. Eutyches was honourably acquitted; and St. Flavian was deposed. Unmasked violence was used to force the bishops to subscribe to this last measure. The legates escaped with their lives, having uttered a final protest in the single word 'contradicitur.' The Council was dubbed by the Pope a *Latrocinium* or Gang of Brigands, and the name has stuck to it.

Theodosius died in 450 and was succeeded by Marcian. In the following year a Council met at Chalcedon to repair the scandal of the *Latrocinium*. Like the *Latrocinium* it consisted of Eastern bishops, of whom more than 600 were present, and papal legates. The Emperor was represented by lay officials. Proceedings were opened by the legates demanding that Dioscorus should leave his place among the bishops and be put upon his trial because 'he had presumed to hold a Council without the authority of the Apostolic See, which had never been done, nor was lawful to do.'<sup>1</sup> He was condemned at the third session of the Council, sentence being pronounced by the legates in the name of the Pope and the Council. It may be noted that the only defence which Dioscorus offered for his treatment of the legates at the *Latrocinium* was an attempt to cast the blame upon others. Also, he was ready to throw Eutyches overboard. This was typical of the Middle Path, which the Monophysites afterwards tried to steer, between Chalcedon and Eutychianism. The acquittal

<sup>1</sup> Dioscorus had continued the Council after the flight of the legates.

of the heresiarch at the Latrocinium was always a raw place with them.

In the second session the creeds of Nicea and Constantinople, and two Epistles of St. Cyril of Alexandria which stood as authentic monuments of the Faith defined at the third General Council, were read. Then followed the Tome of St. Leo. It was received with such acclamations as 'This is the Faith of the Apostles . . . this is the Faith of the Fathers . . . Peter has thus spoken through Leo.' During the interval between the second and fifth sessions of the Council, practically all the bishops had subscribed, or in some other way declared their adherence to the Tome.<sup>1</sup>

In the fifth session a storm arose which threatened to wreck the Council. A definition was drafted which did not satisfy the legates. This document has not been preserved, but it apparently contained the ambiguous expression 'Of Two Natures' instead of the unambiguous one 'In Two Natures.' The legates at once declared their intention of returning to Italy, where another Council would be held. The Imperial officers came to the rescue. Did the bishops, they demanded, accept the Tome? The bishops declared they did accept the Tome; they even ventured to affirm that their definition confirmed it, but they would not make the desired alteration. The Emperor intervened. The bishops might appoint a fresh committee to draft another definition; or they might individually declare their Faith through their respective metropolitans. If neither course pleased them, then, seeing that they refused to give a stable definition respecting the Faith, the Council must be transferred to Italy. There was still some show of opposition which the Imperial officers quelled with the dilemma, 'Dioscorus says "Of Two Natures," Leo, "In Two Natures." Which will you follow?' 'We believe with Leo,' they replied, 'not with Dioscorus. Whoever opposes this is an Eutychian.' 'Well then,' rejoined the Imperial officers, 'add to the definition according to the judgment of our most holy Leo.' This was decisive, and a definition was drawn up such as the Pope required.

<sup>1</sup> Except the Egyptian bishops, who refused on the ground they could do nothing without their Patriarch, i.e. till a successor to Dioscorus had been appointed. They pleaded their lives would not be safe when they returned home if they did so.

The Council was not concluded before a monk named Theodosius hurried off to Palestine proclaiming that the Faith was betrayed, and Nestorianism set up in its place.<sup>1</sup> He took forcible possession of the see of Jerusalem and was able to maintain his position for two years. In Egypt the bulk of the people espoused the cause of Dioscorus. There were fierce riots in Alexandria and savage reprisals on the part of the government. In 457 the Catholic patriarch Proterius was murdered, and his see usurped by Timothy the Cat. Timothy was ejected three years later.

In 470 a similar attack was made on the see of Antioch by Peter the Tanner. He was ejected about a year later. In 476 Timothy and Peter were once more in possession of Alexandria and Antioch respectively. They were both ousted by the Emperor Zeno in 477. Five years later Zeno grew weary of the struggle, and issued his famous Henoticon which anathematised Eutyches and put aside the Council of Chalcedon, passing over the question of the One or Two Natures. The Henoticon was, of course, rejected by Rome; and for thirty-five years the East was in schism.

There were two types of dissidents from the Council of Chalcedon: the ultras who may be classed together as Eutychians (though strictly speaking this term should be confined to the avowed followers of the heresiarch), and the more sober Monophysites who anathematised Eutyches, and endeavoured to strike out a middle path between the extravagances with which he was credited, and Chalcedon. It would not be possible to draw a sharp line of demarcation between the two parties. But such men as the *Phantasaists*, with their denial of the objective reality of the Sacred Humanity, and those who held that It was so intermingled with the Divine Nature, that the latter became *passible* and suffered on the Cross, were clearly on the Eutychian side of the boundary: and on the other hand those who held that the Divine Nature, while forming one composite Nature with the Sacred Humanity, yet remained distinct and unaltered

<sup>1</sup> A report was circulated that the Pope had repudiated the Council. It had this much foundation in fact—he rejected the 28th canon, elevating Constantinople to the dignity of the second See in Christendom. St. Leo probably foresaw that bishops in such close proximity to the court would prove very indifferent guardians of the spiritual independence of the Church.

(they used, or rather abused, the analogy of soul and body) were on the Monophysite side.

Some of the Monophysites came so near orthodoxy, that a contemporary Catholic bishop, Vigilius of Thapsus, declares that many of them did in reality hold the Catholic doctrine, but were afraid to profess it except by circumlocutions. He applies to them the words of the Psalmist, *they were afraid where no fear was*. They were afraid of the term *Physis* or Nature. They would not accept it as explained by St. Leo and the Council, but insisted that it must have another meaning, and imply the Nestorian doctrine of a human Personality in Christ. There was something to be said on behalf of their timidity. Many of the ancient Fathers had avoided the term, or been very chary of using it, employing in its stead such expressions as 'The Man,' 'Manhood,' 'The Flesh.' They too, like the Monophysites, had feared that the word might be taken to imply those seemingly inseparable adjuncts of human nature, viz. (1) a human personality, and (2) the frailties in the moral order which are the consequences of original sin.<sup>1</sup> Moreover, St. Cyril's celebrated formula could easily be represented as almost canonising the restriction of the term, in the Mystery of the Incarnation, to the Divine Nature. It is hardly necessary to point out that to avoid a word while it is open to misconstruction is one thing, and to refuse it after such misconstruction has been carefully provided against is another.<sup>2</sup> The ultra-conservatism of the Monophysites flung the door wide open to a new heresy.

The above is a brief summary of that chapter in early church history which brought the theory of the *Via Media*, elaborated by Newman in his 'Prophetical Office of the Church,' tumbling about its champion's ears. In the 'Apologia' he describes *how* it affected him, but says very little about why it did so. The omission can be partly, but only partly, supplied from others of his published writings, and in some measure from his correspondence. It is only a very incomplete account of what passed through his mind that can be attempted, for he never fully recorded it, very likely—indeed, he as much as says so—he could

<sup>1</sup> Compare such expressions as 'Poor human nature'; 'What can you expect from human nature?' and the like.

<sup>2</sup> For the employment of the word before the Council of Chalcedon, see Newman's dissertation on St. Cyril's formula, ΜΙΑ ΦΥΣΙΣ ΤΟΥ ΘΕΟΥ ΛΟΓΟΥ ΣΕΣΑΡΚΩΜΕΝΗ, in *Tracts Theolog. and Eccles.* pp. 331 ff.

not. It was a process of recognition or identification by which he became convinced that (1) the Church of to-day which is in communion with the see of St. Peter, is the representative of the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries which was able to declare her own mind against the Arian, the Nestorian, and the Eutychian; and that (2) he, for his part, was in a position analogous to that of the semi-Arians, and semi-Eutychians or Monophysites. Recognising is a process which it is difficult to explain to others, or even to oneself. Who could put into words the means by which he is able to identify his own handwriting? or stand cross-examination on how he can discern the voices, footfall, or features of his friends?

The first shock to Newman was the great power of the Pope. It grew upon him, as his mind became steeped in the Epistles of St. Leo and the Acts of the Council of Chalcedon, that this was something which he had not before realised, to which he had been blind partly through prejudice, and partly because he had hitherto read the Fathers through the eyes of others.

'In June and July I found my eyes opened to a state of things very different from what I had learned from my natural guides (i.e. the great Anglican divines). The prejudice, or whatever name it be called, which had been too great for conviction from the striking facts of the Arian history, could not withstand the history of St. Leo and the Council of Chalcedon. I saw that, if the early times were to be my guide, the Pope had a very different place in the Church from what I had supposed. When this suspicion had once fair possession of my mind the whole English system fell about me on all sides.'<sup>1</sup>

This 'the place of the Pope' was only a beginning, and a beginning which he did not directly follow up. 'I doubt,' he writes in the 'Apologia,' 'whether I ever held any of the Pope's powers to be *de jure divino* while I was in the Anglican Church.'<sup>2</sup> He did not make up his mind upon this point,

<sup>1</sup> P. 17. Compare letter to Rogers in July, giving an account of the progress of his studies. 'Two things are remarkable at Chalcedon—the great power of the Pope (as great as he claims now almost), and the marvellous interference of the civil power, as great almost as in our kings.' He jestingly makes the latter a set off against the former. The letter is printed in Miss Mozley's *Letters and Corr.* &c. ii. 254.

<sup>2</sup> P. 113. 'Not that,' he continues, 'I saw any difficulty in the doctrine; not that in connexion with the history of St. Leo, the idea of his infallibility did not cross my mind, for it did.'

any more than he did upon Transubstantiation, and many other doctrines, till he accepted them on the testimony and authority of the Catholic Church. But the door had been opened to a host of other questionings. The truth is, the question of the Pope's authority was never regarded by Newman as adequately representing the real difference between England and Rome. It did not go to the root of their quarrel, and to treat it as if it did was to obscure the real issue. If the Church, Catholic and Roman, had been confronted throughout the world by a Church Catholic but not Roman, having the same conception of her rights and duties, making the same exclusive claim to the authority which the Church of St. Athanasius and St. Basil, of St. Ambrose and St. Leo, had claimed—under such conditions the crucial question, the essential point of difference, might well have been the authority of the Pope. But this was not how matters stood between England and Rome. The root of their divergence lay much deeper. It was to be found in their irreconcilable ideas concerning the unity of the Church, and her office in regard to the Faith. These, therefore, were the questions which had first to be disposed of. When that had been done it would be time to settle the question of the Pope's authority, if, indeed, it was not found to have already settled itself.

The method uniformly followed by Newman, both before and after 1839, up to the time when he abandoned the controversy, was as follows. He first tried to show that the English Church, in spite of her isolation, was not outside Catholic unity. This, he candidly admitted, was the difficult part of his argument, and he did not try to destroy his opponents' conception of unity, but to provide an alternative view. Having done this, he took the offensive and accused Rome of adding to the Faith. His Catholic adversaries kept on much the same ground. They insisted on the unity and catholicity of the Church, and on her authority; and they defended the doctrines which their opponents attacked. Among these the Roman primacy was not very prominent. Both sides seem to have realised that it was idle for men, whose ideas of the Church were fundamentally different, to dispute about the form of her government.

'Is there anything whereof it may be said, See, this is new? It hath been already of old time, which was



before us.'<sup>1</sup> Newman was feeling about for a Middle Path between Protestantism and the Council of Trent. Up to the autumn of 1839 it did not occur to him that his experiment was other than a novel one. It might succeed, it might fail, but as it had no counterpart in history, it was no use looking there for auguries of success or of failure. Now it flashed upon him that history was merely repeating itself. The Monophysites with a very plausible *Via Media* between Eutyches and the Council of Chalcedon, and, as he came to feel in 1841, the semi-Arians trying to steer between Arius and the Council of Nicea, had both forestalled him. 'To his confusion and distress [he is speaking of himself in the third person] he found in history a veritable *Via Media* in both the semi-Arian and Monophysite parties, and these, as being heretical, broke his attachment to middle paths.'<sup>2</sup>

He was also much impressed by the inability of the Monophysites to keep clear of the Eutychians. Their middle path showed up well enough on paper, but to keep one's footing on it was not easy. It ran between a mountain and a bog, and those who would not step off on to the mountainside were continually found floundering in the bog. 'It might have been charitably hoped that the Monophysites' difference from the Catholics had been simply a matter of words, as it is allowed by Vigilius of Thapsus really to have been in many cases; but their refusal to obey the voice of the Church was a token of real error in their faith, and their implicit heterodoxy is proved by their connection, in spite of themselves, with the extreme or ultra party whom they so vehemently disowned. It is very observable that ingenious as is their theory and sometimes perplexing to a disputant, the Monophysites never could shake themselves free of the Eutychians; and though they could draw intelligible lines on paper between the two doctrines, yet in fact by a hidden fatality their partisans were ever running into or forming alliance with the anathematised extreme.'<sup>3</sup> With this example before him one can easily understand the peculiar horror with which he regarded an alliance between English Churchmen and Prussian Lutherans such as the Jerusalem Bishopric scheme seemed to contemplate.

He also seems to have felt that according to the principles

<sup>1</sup> Eccles. i. 10.

<sup>2</sup> *Via Media*, i. 16.

<sup>3</sup> *Development*, p. 314.

of the *Via Media* the Monophysites ought not to have been condemned. Commenting on the reasons given by Eutyches for refusing the formula, presented to him at the synod of Constantinople, he says 'It is plain . . . that there could be no *consensus*<sup>1</sup> against him, as the word is now commonly understood'; and a little further on, 'Much might be said on the plausibility of the defence which Eutyches might have made for his doctrine, from the history and documents of the Church before his time.'<sup>2</sup>

In a like tone he comments on the definition passed at Chalcedon, that it 'is the Apostolic Truth once delivered to the Saints is most firmly to be received, from faith in that overruling Providence which is by special promise extended to the acts of the Church; moreover that it is in simple accordance with the faith of St. Athanasius, St. Gregory Nazianzen, and all the other Fathers, will be evident to the theological student in proportion as he becomes familiar with their works: but the historical account of the Council is this, that a formula which the creed did not contain, which the Fathers did not unanimously witness, and which some eminent Saints had almost in set terms opposed, which the whole East refused, as a symbol, not once but twice . . . and refused upon the grounds of its being an addition to the Creed, was forced upon the Council, not indeed as being such an addition [i.e. it was not actually inserted in the Creed like the term *Consubstantial*], yet, on the other hand, not for subscription merely, but for acceptance as a definition of faith under the sanction of an anathema—forced on the Council by the resolution of the Pope of the day, acting through his legates, and supported by the civil power.'<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> He refers to the rigoristic interpretation of the Vincentian canon *quod ubique &c.*, which interpretation was in his opinion necessary for the Anglican position. See *Essay on Development*, pp. 14, 15.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 301 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Development*, p. 312. He goes on: 'It cannot be supposed that such a transaction would approve itself to the Churches of Egypt . . . they disowned the authority of the Council and called its adherents Chalcedonians and Synodites.' In a footnote on 'Chalcedonians' he writes: 'I cannot find my reference for this fact.' The omission can be supplied after the lapse of more than seventy years. In 1838 Newman reviewed Palmer's *Treatise on the Church*. Palmer makes the same statement (i. 422), giving as his authority Buchanan's *Christian Researches*, p. 123. Buchanan in his travels came across a creed still in use among the Monophysites in which the errors of Arius, Sabellius . . . Nestorius and the *Chalcedonians* were anathematised. The fact would stick in

There is a further aspect of the same subject, viz. the significance of what was done at the Council, which cannot be passed over, though it is impossible to do justice to it in a few words.<sup>1</sup>

Newman tells us in the 'Apologia' that the controversy between England and Rome did not in his view turn upon the infallibility of the Pope; 'it turned upon the question of the Faith and the Church.' 'This,' he continues, 'was my issue of the controversy from the beginning to the end. There was a contrariety of claims between the Roman and the Anglican religions, and the history of my conversion is simply the process of working it out to a solution. In 1838 I illustrated it by the contrast presented to us by the Madonna and Child, and a Calvary. The peculiarity of the Anglican theology was this, that it "supposed the Truth to be entirely objective and detached, not" (as in the theology of Rome) "lying hid in the bosom of the Church as if one with her, clinging to and (as it were) lost in her embrace, but as being sole and unapproachable as on the Cross or at the Resurrection, with the Church close by, but in the background."'<sup>2</sup>

The context of the passage written 'in 1838' will bring out his meaning more clearly: 'The received notion in the English School seems to be that the faith which the Apostles delivered, has ever existed in the Church whole and entire, ever recognised as the faith, and ascertainable as such, and separable (to speak generally) from the mass of opinions, which with it have obtained a footing among Christians. It is considered definite in its outline, though its details admit of more or less perfection; and in consequence it is the property of each individual, so that he may battle for it in his day, how great soever the party attacking it; nay, as not receiving it from the Church of the day, but through other sources besides, historical and

Newman's memory though he had only casually come across it. He would remember Hurrell Froude calling Catholics 'those miserable Tridentines.'

<sup>1</sup> And, it must be added, impossible to be sure that one is not reading more into Newman than there is warrant for. Up to now one has had the *Essay on Development* as a guide. The reflections which he makes there on the history of the Monophysites are likely to be those which he made in 1839. But he had no occasion in the chapter of the *Development* which treats of the Monophysites to enter into the question now about to be considered.

<sup>2</sup> *Apologia*, pp. III-III2.

scriptural, he may defend it, if needs be, against the Church, should the Church depart from it. . . . This is the doctrine of Fundamentals,<sup>1</sup> and its peculiarity is this, that it supposes the Truth to be entirely objective and detached,' &c.<sup>2</sup>

It is difficult to imagine that Newman, with this issue definitely shaped in his mind, should take up the history of one of the General Councils, and yet not be constrained to ask himself which of the two theologies, the English or the Roman, it favoured. The Council with which he was occupied, like previous Councils, put forward a definition in terms selected by itself, and anathematised or unchurched those who refused to accept it. He is likely to have felt that such a procedure was less easy to justify on the supposition that the Faith is something separable or detached from the Church, than on the contrary supposition. A definition is a claim on the part of the Church to a right to interpret the Faith, and the superadded anathema is an emphatic denial of such a right to others. It may be observed that at Chalcedon the claim and the denial are particularly marked because the Monophysites approached the Faith from externally the same point of view as the Council. They did not rationalise like the Arians, or put forward their own interpretations of Scripture as the Nestorians may be said to have done; but they rested their whole case upon tradition. One may put the question which the phenomenon of a General Council is likely to have suggested to Newman's mind thus. Suppose England, Moscow and Rome to be brought together in a General Council, and suppose this Council to decide questions as delicate in its day as was the Monophysite controversy in the fifth century—would not the acceptance of the definitions of such a Council as irreformable, entail a complete revolution of spirit and character in English divinity?

<sup>1</sup> By 'Fundamentals' he seems to have understood the doctrine contained in the Creed as representing *essentials*, see Prophetic Office (*Via Media*, i. 216-7). It may be noted here that in the Prophetic Office (1) when Newman speaks of the Creed in the singular he means both the Western and the Eastern type; (2) he seems to assume that the Creed contained all that was essential, and not merely the heads of doctrines communicated to catechumens. Yet the Creed says nothing about the Eucharist!

<sup>2</sup> Palmer's *View of Faith and Unity* reprinted in *Essays Crit. and Hist.* i. 209. By a curious irony of fate, Newman's celebrated Essay in the *Rambler* was delated at Rome as contradicting that very view of the magisterium which made him a Catholic.

But it would be presumptuous to pursue this train of thought any further. One runs the risk of reading more into Newman than one has a right to. All that is certain is (1) that the question of 'the Faith and the Church,' as described in the 'Apologia,' was before his mind in 1839; (2) that, if not then, at all events very soon he began to feel that from the English point of view the General Councils were a difficulty;<sup>1</sup> (3) that he realised he was not the first Anglican to feel this difficulty. An imposing list of divines could be drawn up to whom the definitions, or at least the anathemas of the Councils seemed out of harmony with English theology. These solved the difficulty by something like the following compromise, which, of course, Newman could not accept. On the one hand they defended the definitions as true doctrine; on the other, they were prepared, if opportunity offered, to enter into communion with Monophysites and Nestorians in the East. They excused them on the ground either that their differences from the Church were verbal rather than real, or, that by keeping to the Creeds they preserved the essentials of the Catholic Faith.<sup>2</sup>

On August 30 Newman noted down in a memorandum book which he kept, 'Finished my reading on Monophysitism.' In the 'Dublin Review' of the same month appeared the celebrated article of Dr. Wiseman in which a parallel was drawn between the Anglicans and the Donatists. This article made a considerable stir, and Newman's attention was called to it about the middle of September. He read it without being much impressed by it. He had discovered his own lineaments in the Monophysites; but he did not see them reflected in the Donatists. The position of these turbulent sectaries seemed to differ materially from that of the English Church. But a friend laid his finger on a passage from St. Augustine, quoted in the article, containing the words 'Securus judicat orbis terrarum,' and repeated them again and again to him, till they rang in his ears. St. Augustine did not ransack the dusty archives of the past in order to confute the Donatists, but appealed to the living present Church of his day; and her judgment, which he triumphantly quoted as final, covered the case of all schisms whatever their peculiarities might be.

<sup>1</sup> See *infra*, p. 22.

<sup>2</sup> See *Diff. of Ang.* i. 389 ff.

To two only of his friends did Newman unburden his mind—Frederic Rogers and Henry Wilberforce. The latter thirty years afterwards described how this happened in his case :

‘ It was in the beginning of October 1839, that he made the astounding confidence, mentioning the two subjects which had inspired the doubt, the position of St. Leo in the Monophysite controversy, and the principle “*securus judicat orbis terrarum*” in that of the Donatists. He added that he felt confident that, when he returned to his rooms and was able fully and calmly to consider the whole matter, he should see his way completely out of the difficulty. But, he said, “I cannot conceal from myself, that for the first time since I began the study of theology, a vista has been opened before me, to the end of which I do not see.” He was walking in the New Forest, and he borrowed the form of his expression from the surrounding scenery.<sup>1</sup> His companion, upon whom such a fear came like a thunder-stroke, expressed a hope that Mr. Newman might die rather than take such a step. He replied, with deep earnestness, that he had thought, if ever the time should come when he was in serious danger, of asking his friends to pray that if it was not indeed the will of God, he might be taken away before he did it. Of such a [danger<sup>2</sup>] meanwhile he spoke only as a possibility in the future, by no means as of a thing that had already arrived. But, he added, with special reference to Dr. Wiseman’s article on the Donatists, “It is quite necessary that I should give a satisfactory answer to it, or I shall have the young men around me—such men,” he added, “as Ward of Balliol—going over to Rome.” Hopeful, however, as he still was, it was impossible not to feel

Haeret lateri lethalis arundo ;

for he would walk some time in silent musing, and then say “One thing I am sure I can promise you, that I shall never take such a step unless Pusey and Keble agree with me that it is a duty.” At another time, “I wonder whether such a step would be justifiable if a hundred of us saw it to be their duty to take it with me ?” These words may

<sup>1</sup> He had used the term ‘vista’ in his letter to Rogers written a few days previously ; see Miss Mozley, *Letters &c.* ii. 256.

<sup>2</sup> There are clearly some misprints and omissions in this sentence.

not be quite exact, but the deep wound which they branded upon the inmost soul of the hearer makes it quite impossible that they should not be correct in substance.'<sup>1</sup>

The reader of the letters contained in this volume will have no doubt of the more than substantial accuracy of Mr. Wilberforce's recollections. The ideas, almost the very words which he placed in Newman's mouth, will be found recurring again and again in them.

Newman's confidence that he should see his way out of his difficulties when he was back in his rooms was in great measure justified. He set himself to reply to Dr. Wiseman in an article entitled 'The Catholicity of the Anglican Church';<sup>2</sup> and this article quieted his mind for about two years. These years might be called the St. Martin's summer of his Anglicanism. The sun shone out finely during the day, but the nights grew longer and more chilly.

The crisis through which he had passed did not at first seem to bring him any nearer to Rome. It destroyed, but did not build up. 'Down had come the Via Media, as a definite theory or scheme, under the blows of St. Leo'; 'I had no positive theory: I was very nearly a pure Protestant,'<sup>3</sup> i.e. with nothing to go upon except anti-Romanism. Yet it is difficult to see what tangible difference as regards his position this tremendous upheaval in his mind had made. Before 1839 he wished to see the doctrines of the primitive church without 'Roman additions,' or Protestant suppressions of them, realised in the Anglican Church. It was the same too in 1840 and 1841.<sup>4</sup> There then he was in effect still on the middle path, but with this difference; before 1839 he marched along it gaily, after 1839 he shuddered at it as an ill-omened road—*vestigia terrent*, the footprints of Dioscorus and his crew. Again, before 1839 he had weighed the strength of the Roman position, as presenting a Church Catholic and undivided, and the weakness of England as being apparently in a state of schism; but this weakness was more than compensated in his eyes by what he considered the Roman additions to the Creed. His mind was the same for some time after

<sup>1</sup> *Dublin Review*, April 1869, pp. 327-8.

<sup>2</sup> Reprinted in *Essays Crit. and Hist.* vol. ii., with what almost amounts to a commentary.

<sup>3</sup> *Apologia*, p. 120.

<sup>4</sup> The 'Ghost' appeared again towards the end of 1841 when he resumed his studies.

1839 with two important modifications: (1) St. Augustine had taught him that a state of schism or isolation was an even graver matter than he formerly judged it to be<sup>1</sup>; (2) the suspicion gradually grew upon him that Roman 'additions' to the Creed were not so patent an introducing into it of alien matter as he had once supposed.

The following are memoranda drawn up by Newman during the latter half of 1844. He obviously intended them to serve as explanations of the change in his religious opinions; but he never completed or revised them. They are merely hasty jottings which he did not go on with. Fragmentary though they are, no apology is needed for printing them. It should be added that some portions of them have been difficult to decipher, and, what is more serious, the order or arrangement of the material which the writer intended is not always clear.

## I

*July 28, 1844. Memorandum in case of need—a rough draft.*

Anyone who thinks well of me will easily understand that it would be much more pleasant to me under present circumstances to be silent than to speak. But I do not think I have a right to indulge my wishes. There are persons whom my conduct is likely to perplex, if it is unaccompanied by explanation, and they are just the persons whose feelings I should be most grieved to disturb.

I believe I have no other motive in writing. I am too sure that I am right in the step on which I have determined, to feel disposed on any other ground to say a word. I have waited till I could act without doubt or hesitation, I have waited in much dreariness though not in sadness for years—I have not waited in order at the end of that time to get into controversy about myself. Still, those who think well of me and wish me well, have a claim on me to say how it is I have come to hold what once I disowned,

<sup>1</sup> He still thought this difficulty could be met fairly and squarely, and attempted to do so in his article 'The Catholicity of the Anglican Church.'



and they and their feelings are in most cases unknown to me, and couldn't be reached by any private communication. I cannot be ashamed that my first efforts were to support the Church within which I was born, or that I came to her system with a confidence it was true, and studied it with prepossessions in its favour, and accepted it with my heart as well as with my intellect. I was zealous for her, I revered her divines, I entered into their theory, ecclesiastical and theological—I admired its internal consistency and beauty. I read the Fathers through them, I read the history of the first centuries with their eyes. My object was, in what I wrote, to serve them, and their and my Church; to develop their views, and to supply and harmonise what was wanting or irregular [he wrote above, 'irregular' 'faulty' as alternatives] in them.

But so it was, in June and July 1839 reading the Monophysite controversy I found my eyes opened to a state of things very different from what I had learned from my natural guides. The prejudice, or whatever name it be called, which had been too great for conviction from the striking facts of the Arian history, could not withstand the history of St. Leo and the Council of Chalcedon. I saw that, if the early times were to be my guide, the Pope had a very different place in the Church from what I had supposed. When this suspicion had once fair possession of my mind, and I looked on the facts of the history for myself, the whole English system fell about me on all sides, the ground crumbled under my feet, and in a little time I found myself in a very different scene of things. What had passed could not be recalled.

I must not leave the impression that this took place in an instant. What my state of feeling was through the summer of 1839 I cannot tell. I was engaged in the theological controversy<sup>1</sup> and that of course had far the more prominent place in my thoughts, but toward the end of October my attention was drawn to the subject of the Donatists, in consequence of an article in the 'Dublin

<sup>1</sup> [The question of the 'Two Natures.']

Review.' The English explanation I found a second time unequal to the facts of the case—and for a time the grave truth<sup>1</sup> that the Anglican Church is in a state of schism had possession of my mind.

Yet I did not dare to trust my impression—and I resisted it. I trust I did so on principle; certainly I have long thought it a duty to resist such impressions—If true they will return (St. Theresa).

I collected myself and wrote a paper against the article in the 'Dublin Review' ['On the Catholicity of the English Church' which appeared in the 'British Critic' for Jan. 1840]. This paper quieted me for nearly two years, till the autumn of 1841.

Meanwhile an important event had occurred. No. 90 had been censured (at that time, as far as I recollect my doubts were as much quieted as they have been at any time since 1839).

At that time, though what had happened had left permanent effects upon my opinions, my doubts had so far passed away that I could, at the Bishop's wish, repeat what I had said against the Church of Rome so far as this, viz. that I thought that there was error in it, and till that error was removed one could not hold communion with it. This indeed I was unwilling to do, not liking to commit myself again, with the consciousness of the chance of change in prospect, but I did not feel that I had any right to put a contingency against a Bishop's command—to confess I had had doubts while I made it, would have been to scatter firebrands.

(You say I have changed. I have. There is nothing to be ashamed of. Changes there are which carry shame, but why should this? Is it any shame that being born under a certain faith, I took it up and tried to maintain it? that I loved the Church into whose communion I had been received? that I adopted the system of its chief divines? that having a living in it, I felt I had a charge to fulfil? that being accused of inclining to Rome—and having no

<sup>1</sup> [The word used in the MS. is quite illegible. It may perhaps be 'doubt.'

consciousness that I held what our divines had not held, and feeling with them that there were things in Rome with which I could not agree, that I should say so? Ought I to have held my tongue when accused untruly? etc.) On the last words of my article on 'Private Judgment' <sup>1</sup> compared with the Jerusalem Bishopic, is not that an act of schism?

## II

*Rough draft of a letter to a friend* <sup>2</sup>

October 30/44. Carissime—If I consulted my own feelings and habits, I should do what I have so often done when I was exposed to obloquy on the part of others, keep silence. I don't take to myself merit or demerit for such silence on former occasions. It is my way. I feel much indisposed to attempt what I despair of succeeding in. Men *will* misunderstand one, whatever one says—that is those who will, will, and those who will not, will not. Those who feel any love for a person will interpret his most perplexing words and deeds in a charitable way—and those who already think one utterly self-deceived, hopelessly inconsistent, and faulty and unsound at the hidden springs of character will put a bad interpretation on everything—*Decipi vult populus, et decipiatur*. I am impatient of attempts to which I despair of an issue. <sup>3</sup> If this comes from disdain it is miserable no doubt. But it takes up time, wearies, unsettles the mind; and writing itself is a trouble, and having to arrange the thoughts. And then when a man vividly feels that Time is the great arbiter of actions and corrector of judgments, why should he not leave the elucidation of his thoughts and notions to Time?

'Leaving the thing to Time who solves all doubt,  
By bringing Truth his glorious daughter out.'

And above all if he dare look forward to that Day in which

<sup>1</sup> [Written July 1841; reprinted in *Essays Crit. and Hist.* vol. ii.]

<sup>2</sup> Evidently intended to be an Open Letter.

<sup>3</sup> Written above 'when I cannot see their utility.'

Time will end, or if now he is able to look beyond this world to judgment now passing out of sight (yes now passed), and if the judgment within his own heart, after all drawbacks, gives him hopes that the unseen judgment is more gracious than the thoughts of men, he will feel very little disposed to put himself out of his way to do for himself what he trusts will one day be done for him. 'Populus me sibilat, at mihi plaudo ipse domi,' rises in his mind with a Christian meaning.

Yet there are considerations which overcome this sluggish habit, inclination, or by whatever better name you choose to call it, without laying claim to any very exalted charity or any very keen sympathy towards others. Surely one may have a conviction about what is due to certain persons, persons whom one has never seen, persons who only know one through one's writings strong and bitter [?] enough to make it a duty to speak now or not to have spoken at all. Do then what you will with this letter; you have the entire disposal of it: though I shall write it as far as I can with the thought of an individual friend before me, not of my well-wishers in general, much less of my ill-wishers. But I do not wish my name put, for that would be like a call on persons to read it, whereas in an anonymous pamphlet it is more their own act, or they may excuse themselves, though there are persons of course whom I *should* wish to see it.

Well then you know what this most distressing, awful confession is I have to bring out, if I can find words for it. Long, very long, as the subject of it has been before my mind, so that it might seem to have lost its freshness—the contemplation of its keenness; it is not so. And you will understand yourself what I would say without my saying it outright in my first sentence.

It is at this time above four years since [that] a clear conviction rose on my mind, from reading the early controversies of the Church, that we were *in loco hereticorum*. I saw the position of the Novatian, the Arian, the Donatist, the Nestorian, the Monophysite, a very definite one. I saw

their position, their characteristics, their acts, their fortunes ; these were all substantially one and the same. We seemed to me faithfully to reflect them at this day : i.e. to be as like them as they are to each other. I saw they generally consisted of a two-fold variety, an extreme party and a moderate. I saw our own image reflected in the ancient *Via Media*. I saw that of [the] Church of Rome reflected in the severe, uncompromising, and if you will, imperious, peremptory behaviour of the saints of the ancient Church, St. Ignatius, St. Cyprian, St. Athanasius, St. Augustine, St. Leo. But at first I saw still more strongly the opposite fact ; not merely that Protestant bodies, that individuals, that numbers among ourselves, but, if it must be spoken, that our own communion, as such, was there where heretical churches were of old.

It became far more certain to me that we were cut off from the Church [he wrote first 'in heresy and schism' and then crossed it out] than that the Roman Church has departed from primitive doctrine [he wrote first 'erred in doctrine']. I saw more in the early Church to convince me that separation from the great body of the Church, and separation from the See of St. Peter was the token of heresy and schism, than that the additions which that great body, which the See of Peter has received upon the primitive faith were innovations [he first wrote 'corruptions']. I was not so certain that they might not be developments, instead of corruptions, as I was certain that we were not in a position to know, that our Church was not in a position to pronounce whether they are corruptions or not.

I ought to illustrate all this—but I do not know how to do justice to my own reasonings and impressions. They are past not present—the impression remains, but the process of argument is like a scaffolding taken down when the building is completed. I could not recollect all the items which went to make up my convictions, nor could I represent it to another with that force with which it came to my own mind. Corroborations too are generally coincidences—resulting from distinct courses of thought or from

the bodies of fact which require a certain frame of mind to appreciate, and a most extended space even to explain. However I will do my best.

Now first I have very long been perplexed about these [ecumenical] Councils. Anglicans generally agree in receiving at least four—On what ground do they receive them? Why do they receive the Nicene Creed? If merely because it is Scriptural, then, of course, they do not receive the Council, as a Council, at all. They do not receive the Council in any other light than they receive the words of any private person who agrees with them in opinion. If as being near the times of the Apostles, this is not receiving the Council, else we 'receive' St. Athanasius or St. Hilary. But to receive a Council is to receive it *as* a Council. It is to hold that certain kinds of Councils are infallible, and certain actual Councils are true. Now I cannot make out in what sense the Council of Nicea, Constantinople, Ephesus or Chalcedon are true Councils, in which that of Trent is not a true Council also. I seem to feel I must either go on to Trent or stop short of Nicea. (Draw out Trent with, (e.g.) Stillingfleet's or Geddes's objections to it, then Chalcedon by way of parallel in this way: 'There is a Council in which' so and so . . . Now this is Chalcedon.)<sup>1</sup>

Again I cannot make out about the separate books of the Canon—why I receive e.g. Esther and not Ecclesiasticus or Wisdom, or (as the late Dr. Arnold speaks) part of the Book of Daniel.

Again about separate doctrines, I cannot see why prayers for the dead are primitive, and not the Pope's Supremacy.

Thus I am in the condition that I must either believe all or none. And so it really is. I see no resting place for the sole of my foot between all and none.

(If I must illustrate what I mean, I will take the Monophysite controversy which affected me most, though I think the Donatist furnishes a stronger instance in point—

<sup>1</sup> In the margin against the words in brackets he wrote 'a separate pamphlet.'

I felt on *what* principle do we receive Chalcedon *yet not* Trent? illustrated by conduct of American Church, being more unshackled than we, which is obliged to receive Nestorians. On same argument which would prove our Church one with Rome would prove our Dissenters one Church with us.)

About at proper place *how far* going into extreme of believing all, lest one should be sceptical as Arnold puts it. No—*reason* comes in. It is irrational to believe so much unless we believe more. This not the mere *relief*, as he says. . . .

### III

#### *An undated fragment*

Of course I do not mean to say that all these thoughts came upon me at once and in their distinctness. But they came forcibly and pointedly enough in 1839 to produce at the time a clear conviction of our unsatisfactory position relatively to Rome which I did not get rid of but with much reasoning and consideration, and only gradually. But through 1840 and the greater part of 1841 I had reconciled myself to things as they are among us, so far as to think it a duty to remain under them, and to acquiesce in the Anglican professions and formularies; not indeed without a strong desire to find or to read them Catholicè; and on the other hand almost an increased anxiety to speak sharply against what I considered the practical corruptions of the Church of Rome. These two things were the two conditions of my feeling it possible to remain where I was; for they of course who insist upon the distinction [written above 'draw a line'] between the authoritative documents and the practical teaching of the Church of Rome, will, of course, be led to speak strongly against her teaching to account [written above 'as a reason'] for not joining her, and to interpret our own Church by her doctrines as a reason for [*here he broke off*].

## IV

*Extract from a letter to a friend (April 5, 1844)*

[THE COUNCIL OF CHALCEDON.] I found what surprised me very much. It struck me at once, but when it began to assume an unsettling character I do not recollect—but I found in that history more matter for serious thought than in anything else I had read . . . Now I cannot bring together all the strange things I found . . . I found the Eastern Church under the superintendence (as I may call it) of Pope Leo. I found that *he* made the Fathers of the Council unsay their decree and pass another, so that (humanly speaking) we owe it to Pope Leo at this day that the Catholic Church holds the true doctrine. . . I found a portentous large body of Christians thrown into schism by this Council—at this day the Churches of Egypt, Syria (in part), and Armenia—and the Schismatics, not like the Arians of a rationalist [character], but with a theology of a warm and elevating character. I found that they appealed, and with much plausibility, to certain of the Fathers, as St. Athanasius and St. Cyril of Alexandria—that they professed to be maintainers of antiquity—that they called their opponents (the Catholics) *Chalcedonians*, as we call the Roman Catholics *Tridentines*. . . Further, I found there was a large middle party as well as an extreme. There was a distinct *Via Media* . . . and there was a large body which went on for some centuries without Bishops—I am writing from memory, but I am sure I am right in all points of consequence—in a word I found a complete and wonderful parallel, as if a prophecy, of the state of the Reformation controversy; and that we were on the anti-Catholic side.

## V

*The same continued*

[THE ARIANS AND SEMI-ARIANS.] I will go on with this part of the subject at the expense of the order of time. I add then that from that time to this, the view thus brought



before me, has grown upon me. I had hitherto read ecclesiastical history with the eyes of our Divines, and taken what they said on faith ; but now I had got *a key*, which interpreted large passages of history which had been locked up from me. I found everywhere one and the same picture, prophetic of our present state ; the Church in communion with Rome decreeing, and heretics resisting. Especially as regards the Arian controversy. How could I be so blind before ! except that I looked at things bit by bit, instead of putting them together. Here was Pope Julius resisting the whole East in defence of St. Athanasius ; the Eusebians at the Great Council of Antioch resisting him, and he appealing to his own authority (in which the historians support him), and declaring that he filled the See of Peter.<sup>1</sup> . . . There were two parties, a *Via Media* and an extreme, both heretical, but the *Via Media* containing pious men whom St. Athanasius and others sympathise in—there were the Kings of the earth taking up the heresy against the Church—there was precisely the same appeal to Scripture, which now obtains, and that grounded on a literal interpretation of its text, to which St. Athanasius always opposes the ‘ecclesiastical sense’—there was the same complaint of introducing novel and unscriptural terms into the Creed of the Church, ‘*consubstantial*’ and ‘*Transubstantiation*,’ being both of philosophical origin ; and if Trent has opposed some previous Councils (which I do not recollect), at least the Nicene council adopted the very term ‘*consubstantial*,’ which a celebrated Council of Antioch, sixty, or seventy years before, condemned or discountenanced.

## VI

*Continuation : April 9, 1844*

[THE DONATISTS.] At the end of the Long Vacation (1839) a number of the ‘*Dublin Review*’ appeared, containing an Article by Dr. Wiseman which made some talk in Oxford.

<sup>1</sup> Julius’ Letter, with Newman’s notes on it, can be read in the *Oxford Library of the Fathers—Historical Treatises of St. Athanasius* (published in 1843). It is interesting to compare the frigid character of the notes with the above.

I looked at it, and treated it very lightly. Persons, who (I suppose) half took up our views, said we were bound to answer it, meaning it was a great difficulty in the way of the Anglican theory. I recollect saying it was 'all the old story'—and would not think about it . . . but I found it, on careful attention, to contain so powerful an argument that I became (I may say) excited about it. . . The argument in the Article in question was drawn from the history of the Donatists, and was directed to show that the English Church was in schism. The fact to which the Monophysite controversy had opened my eyes, that antagonists to Rome, and churches in isolation, were always wrong in primitive times, and which I had felt as a *presumption* against ourselves, this article went on to maintain, as a recognised *principle and rule* in those same ages. It professed that the *fact* of isolation and opposition was *always taken as a sufficient* condemnation of bodies so circumstanced, and, to that extent, that the question was not asked *How did the separation arise?* Which was right, and which wrong? Who made the separation? but that the *fact* of separation was reckoned anciently as decisive against the body separated. This was argued chiefly from the language of St. Augustine, as elicited in the Donatist Controversy, and the same sort of *minute* parallel was drawn, between the state of the Donatists and our own, which I had felt on reading the history of the Monophysites.

## CHAPTER II

### THE NEW SCHOOL OF TRACTARIANS

'I am surprised at your horror of our ultras—some of them are the very persons you would like if you knew them.'—*Newman to Mr. Hope, Dec. 1841.*

No outward event of importance in the history of the Oxford Movement marks the close of 1839 and the following year. But there was one noteworthy feature in the situation—the sudden and unexpected emergence of a new party or school with what were called *Romanising tendencies*. This was the school which 'cut into the original Movement at an angle, fell across its line of thought, and then set about turning that line in its own direction.' It 'knew nothing about the *Via Media* and had heard much of Rome.'<sup>1</sup>

The rise of such a party was a not unnatural consequence of (1) the doctrinal, and (2) the religious principles of the Movement, especially when they encountered opposition.

(1) The movement began at a time when Disestablishment and Disendowment seemed far from remote dangers. It was an attempt not to avert but to provide against such a crisis. The Church must stand for something or cease to exist. What was this something to be, if the State disowned her? The Tractarians found an answer in the two kindred and almost forgotten doctrines of *the Catholic Church* and *the Apostolic Succession*. In the strength of these the clergy could face the worst the State might do. She might discharge them from her service, and leave them to shift for themselves; but if they were the successors of the Apostles she could not deprive them of their mission. Naturally enough, when a number of men had grasped the idea of the Catholic Church with its fundamental note of unity,

<sup>1</sup> *Apologia*, p. 163.

there were among them some to whom the isolated position of their own communion presented itself as an anxious problem. The originators of the movement had not anticipated this; but within little more than two years after it began there was a vague feeling of uneasiness in the air:

'The controversy with Roman Catholics has overtaken us like "a summer's cloud." We find ourselves in various parts of the country preparing for it, yet, when we look back, we cannot trace the steps by which we arrived at our present position. We do not recollect what our feelings were this time last year on the subject—what was the state of our apprehensions and anticipations. All we know is that here we are, from long security ignorant why we are not Roman Catholics, and they, on the other hand, are said to be spreading . . . and taunting us with our inability to argue with them.'<sup>1</sup>

(2) The Tracts represented the doctrinal side of the movement: but there was another influence at work more potent than they. 'The Tracts,' to quote Dean Church, 'were not the most powerful instrument in drawing sympathy to the movement. None but those who remember them can adequately estimate the effect of Mr. Newman's four o'clock sermons at St. Mary's. The world knows them, has heard a great deal about them, has passed its various judgments on them. But it hardly realises that without these sermons the movement might never have gone on, certainly would never have been what it was. . . . While men were reading and talking about the Tracts, they were hearing the sermons; and in the sermons they heard the living meaning, and reason, and bearing of the Tracts. . . . The sermons created a moral atmosphere in which men judged the questions in debate.'<sup>2</sup>

Can there have been any connection of cause and effect between these sermons and the party or school in question? At first sight it would appear certainly not. The sermons treat mainly upon religious and moral subjects, and doctrinally they keep well within the limits of a moderate, one might say, very moderate, high church orthodoxy. Then their tendency is to isolate the hearer from his sur-

<sup>1</sup> Newman, Tract LXXI—reprinted in *Via Media*, vol. ii.

<sup>2</sup> Church, *Oxford Movement*, pp. 129-130.

roundings and almost to prevent him dwelling upon them. It is not by them but by what he is in himself that he will be judged. To each man the two supreme realities are God and his own soul.

The Church and her ordinances are treated chiefly as means of Grace for the individual soul. As for the distressed state of Christendom, the shattered unity of the Church split into three great fragments, the Eastern, the Latin, and the English, this comes before the mind not as an anxious problem, but rather as an incitement to watchfulness and prayer. It is a reminder of that crumbling away of Faith which is to precede the Second Coming. On some minds the effect of such teaching would be to make them withdraw within themselves and be resigned to what there seemed to be no escape from. But on others the effect would be different. The preacher was known to hold, though he did not obtrude them, strong views on the superiority of the single over the married life.<sup>1</sup> He insisted much upon the duty of self-denial ; on the fearful character of sin, especially post-Baptismal sin, on the uncertainty there must always be with regard to this latter as to whether it had yet received pardon ; on the necessity of self-discipline, circumspectness, rigorous self-examination, in a word, of 'working out our salvation in fear and trembling.' By men of one religious party such ideas would be denounced as carnal, legal, trusting in good works, and the like. By those of another party they would be denounced as opposed to the march of intellect, gloomy and superstitious.<sup>2</sup> But there must have been some, certainly not without a share in the *mens naturaliter Christiana*, on whom their effect may best be illustrated by the following passage from 'Loss and Gain.'

'Reding, for instance, felt a difficulty in determining how and when the sins of a Christian are forgiven ; he had a great notion that celibacy was better than married life.

<sup>1</sup> Church, *Oxford Movement*, p. 370.

<sup>2</sup> 'They all discard (what they call) gloomy views of religion . . . and are ready to embrace the pleasant consoling religion natural to a polished age. . . . We are expressly told that "strait is the gate" . . . this is the dark side of religion ; and the men I have been describing cannot bear to think of it. They easily get themselves to believe that these strong declarations of Scripture do not belong to the present age, or are figurative,' *Paroch. and Plain Sermons*, i. 317-319. The Oxford Movement, like all great religious revivals, was fundamentally a call to repentance.

He was not the first person in the Church of England who had had such thoughts ; to numbers, doubtless, before him they had occurred ; but these numbers had looked abroad and seen nothing around them to justify what they felt, and their feelings had, in consequence, either festered within them or withered away. But when a man thus constituted within, falls under the shadow of Catholicism without, then the mighty Creed at once produces an influence upon him. He sees that it justifies his thoughts, explains his feelings ; he understands that it numbers, corrects, harmonises, completes them ; and he is led to ask what is the authority of this foreign teaching.'<sup>1</sup>

But whether chiefly owing to the sermons at St. Mary's or to other causes, the important fact is that the new school which was rising up was as much, if not more, influenced by its religious sympathies as by purely doctrinal and polemical questions. Newman realised this, as many passages both in his letters and published writings show ; and another shrewd observer, Dr. Hook of Leeds, saw it too. As early as January 1840 he wrote to a friend :

'I think that if the Rulers of the Church of England do not take very good care, we shall have ere long a great defection to Romanism. I do not fear the clergy, but there are young men, the generation below us, who have been educated in a school of transcendental metaphysics mingled with religion, and they require something in their religion which will raise the imagination. For a long period there was a prejudice against everything mysterious in religion ; the feeling now is that mystery is *a priori* evidence in favour of a doctrine. These persons see much to admire in Romanism. They admit its doctrinal errors, but they see that many of its practices are superior to our own ; that when men are striving for perfection they receive greater encouragement. Hitherto men's eyes have been blinded to this, partly by Protestant lies, which, discovered,

<sup>1</sup> *Loss and Gain*, pp. 204-5. The sermons at St. Mary's certainly did make men discontented with the existing religious system, and turned their minds elsewhere. Newman felt this (see his letter to Keble, *Apologia*, p. 133) and the authorities felt it too, and did their best to keep young men from going to St. Mary's. It ought to have been a very serious question to these latter why preaching which from a doctrinal point of view might be described as moderately Anglican, which did little more than make real what they themselves professed, should have been unsettling. But they were not in the mood for heart-searchings.

give strength to Romanism, and partly by assertions that attention to these things is superstition, trusting upon works, &c.; the weakness of which dogmatism is easily perceived. Men now see that there is good mingled with the evil of Romanism, and that much of what has hitherto been called superstition is a help to devotion. Having got so far as this, there will be many who will consider the doctrinal differences of less importance than they really are. Surely it is important for our rulers to bear all this in mind, and not only to render the Church of England sound in doctrine, but to do everything that in them lies, according to her principles, to aid men in these their high aspirings after perfection.<sup>1</sup>

These *high aspirings* exposed men 'to the danger of being swayed in their religious enquiries by sympathy rather than reason.'<sup>2</sup> Newman was alive to this danger,<sup>3</sup> and it made him in his own case slow to move, and nerved him to hold others back. But while he could tug might and main at the reins, and keep his team of mettlesome young men, though kicking and plunging, stationary for awhile, he could not try to turn them aside from the high ideals which he set before them.

It is not surprising if individual members of this party sometimes did and said wild or extravagant things. They were under the influence of a great enthusiasm. They had entered suddenly into a new world of ideas, the mutual bearings and proportions of which they had neither the time nor the opportunity to master. Then there was the

<sup>1</sup> *Life of W. F. Hook*, ii. 45, 46.

<sup>2</sup> *Apologia*, p. 165.

<sup>3</sup> He was equally alive to it nearly forty years later, as the following letter will show:

The Oratory, October 11, 1879.

Dear Sir,—In answer to your question, I would observe that there is a great temptation, (as it is to some people) without believing that the Catholic Church is the One Authoritative Oracle of God, and the One Ark of Salvation, to join it merely because they can pray better in it, or have more fervency than in the Anglican Church, and in consequence conceive a '*hope*' of becoming more religious in it than they are at present, whereas the demand which the Church of God makes on them is to *believe her teaching* as the teaching of God. We will say, perhaps they become Catholics; their fervour after a while dies away, their faith is demanded for some doctrine which as yet they have not heard of or considered—and they stumble at it and fall away. They have had no root in themselves—they never have been Catholics in heart, because they never have had faith.—Very truly yours,

J. H. CARD. NEWMAN.

excitement of belonging to the clever party; of fighting against heavy odds; and of the sacrifice which they were making of their future prospects, for it was not long before the authorities made it clear that no good things in the University or the Church should come to those who were the disciples of Dr. Pusey and Mr. Newman.<sup>1</sup> Naturally enough under such circumstances, zeal sometimes got the better of discretion. This was inevitable. 'There will ever be a number of persons professing the opinions of a movement party, who talk loudly and strangely, do odd or fierce things, display themselves unnecessarily, and disgust other people; there will be ever those who are too young to be wise, too generous to be cautious, too warm to be sober, or too intellectual to be humble: of whom human sagacity cannot determine, only the event, and perhaps not even that, whether they feel what they say or how far; whether they are to be encouraged or discouraged.'<sup>2</sup>

A number of this eager and earnest body of men followed Newman to the end. Others, probably a large majority, settled down in Anglicanism; and others, like James Anthony Froude and Mark Pattison, turned to Liberalism. All, or nearly all, kept this in common—they were thankful to the end of their days that at one period of their lives they had come under the influence of Newman.<sup>3</sup>

The following letter is strictly speaking of too early a date for the present volume. But it would be a pity to exclude it on this account, for it forms a fitting introduction to the numerous letters in which Mr. Bowden's health is spoken of. The illness of Mr. Bowden was a great cloud of sorrow and anxiety hanging over Newman's head for the next five years.

<sup>1</sup> 'It became necessary to surrender tutorships, fellowships, and the hopes of them; to find difficulties in getting ordained, to lose slowly the prospects of pleasant curacies and livings, &c.'—Froude, *Nemesis of Faith*, p. 138. There is some exaggeration in this statement. The authorities were not able to deprive men already in possession of their fellowships.

<sup>2</sup> Newman, 'Prospects of the Anglican Church' [April 1839], *Essays Crit. and Hist.* i. 277.

<sup>3</sup> 'The veneration and affection which I felt for you at the time you left us, are in no way diminished. . . . I can truly say that I have learnt more from you than from anyone else with whom I have ever been in contact. Let me subscribe myself for the last time your affectionate son and pupil, Mark Pattison.' From a letter written to Newman in 1883, quoted in Mr. Ward's *Life of Cardinal Newman*, ii. 182.



S. F. Wood, to whom the letter was written, is described in the 'Life of Pusey' (vol. ii. p. 396) as 'a layman of saintly life whose early death was deeply mourned by Pusey and Newman.' He died in 1843. Mr. Bowden died in 1844. It was over his coffin that Newman 'sobbed bitterly to think that he left me still dark as to what the way of truth was, and what I ought to do in order to please God and fulfil His will.' ('Apologia,' p. 227.)

J. H. NEWMAN TO S. F. WOOD, Esq.

Oriel College : February 8, 1839.

Charissime,—Your letter was one of the heaviest I ever had in my life. It was so unexpected. We do rely on man far more than we know ; at least I fancy I have taken it for granted that a long course of usefulness was reserved for Bowden. And now, when the possibility of another course of things is suggested, I seem, what I ought not to do, almost to give up all hope. What a most dreadful stroke is this for Mrs. Bowden—I mean only the idea or prospect—I have written to her a few lines. If I might be earnest about anything which does not concern me, I would plead most strongly for his going abroad *at once*—What has happened is a warning, they should make up their minds to go abroad for three years. It does us good when the first warning is past and over. Do urge this, if you agree with me. The sea always does him good. Naples I should think would be just the place for him and them ; it is dry and bracing. I fear Rome would be relaxing. I feel the hope suggested by what you say about his general ill health—and after all there are very various complaints of the lungs, some much more serious than others—e.g. Mrs. Pusey has two distinct complaints in distinct places—one is getting well—the other (and worse) not. I think this news has brought home to me, more than anything else, how in the midst of life we are in death. It is as if one were standing in a fight, and anyone might be shot down.

I long to see you. Whether we have an election at Easter none of us know. If you do not come then, I shall hope for Whitsuntide.

Love to R. Williams, who has sent me a very nice little book this morning which I rejoice to see—pray thank him.

Ever yours most affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—Can you get for me from Williams the name and direction of the Carver of the Littlemore Eagle?

J. H. NEWMAN TO S. F. WOOD, Esq.

Cholderton: In Fest. S. Mich. 1839.

My dear Wood,—I hear very disappointing accounts of your health—and should some time or other like to know how you are. I saw Bowden two days before he went, and for what I know Rogers saw him off. He was most strikingly better than when you last saw him—almost quite himself. They were all in good spirits, and had done their packing. Mrs. Ward was there and had been helping—and Johnson too. This was on Wednesday. On Friday morning at ten o'clock they were to embark at Blackwall; and are to be at Falmouth to-morrow. I am pleased to think they must have had very fair weather all down the Channel. This [is] all I have to tell you of them, I believe.

R. Williams has led me to look into Dr. W.'s new article in the *Dublin*. I have not studied it, much less referred to his authorities—but I do not deny that it requires considering and has a claim upon us for an answer. I will not at all, if possible, act unfairly by it—but think he must bring out the whole, before anything is done on our part. What I very much fear is our all not keeping together, though moving on the same road. Accident of one kind or other occasions this or that person to anticipate a truth to which others are advancing also—and his anticipating it throws others back. There either is something in what Dr. W. says, or there is not. If not, all will reject it—if

there is, all will accept it, i.e. at length. I think one feels very diffident about one's own judgment—as if it required some exceeding moral perspicacity to be warranted to accept doctrines beyond what one's Church admits—whereas, it being a clear duty at first sight to accept what she enjoins, it were allowable, without any great claim to illumination, to defend these. I feel confident that, if Dr. W. turns out to prove anything, great or little, Keble will eventually see it—and am glad, as well as bound, to wait to see what he says. It is more likely that he should be right than my own judgment. On the other hand, going by my own judgment, even granting, which I do not exactly see, that Dr. W.'s argument is good on the one side, yet that same judgment tells me of arguments good on the other. I almost fear I may give you an appearance of taking this too seriously—but I write on, since I have pen in hand, and from first impressions, which are just the very worst in a matter which depends on an examination of facts and reasonings.

Mozley and my sister are very flourishing. He is full of plans, and, I hope, will be persuaded to take up the subject of the Poor Laws, and other portions of Political Economy. I went down to Rogers for a day when in London—he is very well, but his eyes the same. He has seen an amusing French Priest at Rouen, with whom he had some interesting conversation about Henry Wilberforce.—I am going to the latter worthy next Friday to stay till the 11th when I return to Oxford—

Ever yours, My dear Wood,  
affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

The Dr. W. of this letter is, of course, Wiseman, and the 'article in the *Dublin*' the celebrated one on the Donatists. It was Robert Williams<sup>1</sup> who fastened Newman's attention on the words of St. Augustine quoted in the article, but which had escaped his observation, 'Securus judicat orbis

<sup>1</sup> For an interesting account of him see Ollard's *Short History of the Oxford Movement*, pp. 63, 64 (footnote).

terrarium.' He was a source of much anxiety to Pusey and Newman. 'As to R. W.,' wrote the latter to Pusey in January 1840, 'I have resigned him in my mind some time . . . since I read Dr. W.'s article I have desponded much; for I have said to myself, if even I feel myself hard pressed, what will others who have either not thought so much on the subject, or have fewer retarding motives.' And some months later: 'R. W. is stationary at present; but what is to be done with a man who begins with assuming as a first principle . . . that the Roman is the Catholic Church.'<sup>1</sup> Williams did not remain stationary, and did not realise the fears of his friends, but swung back to a robust Protestantism. It is presumably he to whom Serjeant Bellasis refers in the following memorandum.

'July 7, 1850.—Called on Robert Williams . . . I had not seen him for some time, and did not know how he might be affected by the occurrences of the last few months. He thought there was no divine authority save the Bible . . . the disturbance now making about Mr. Gorham's opinions was absurd. . . . The Roman Catholic Church, he was convinced, was coming to an end, it must fall, it was clearly foreshown in the Revelations. He had been reading a work on Prophecy by Mr. Elliott, which was in his judgment irresistible; it was in four volumes.'<sup>2</sup> In spite of his changes he preserved Newman's friendship—'My friend, an anxiously religious man, now, as then very dear to me, a Protestant still.'<sup>3</sup>

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. W. BOWDEN, Esq.

Oriel College: Nov. 4, 1839.

My dear Bowden,—I have written you a letter, and find it is too heavy for the Marseilles post—so I begin again. We have heard with great pleasure of your safe arrival at your destination; and I congratulate you on your progress towards health and strength, and Mrs. Bowden on the miseries of the voyage being over.

The chief thing I have to tell you concerns Morris of Exeter, whom perhaps you know, perhaps not. He is a

<sup>1</sup> Pusey's *Life*, ii. 152-3.

<sup>2</sup> *Memorials of Mr. Serjeant Bellasis*, p. 101.

<sup>3</sup> *Apologia*, p. 116.

most simple minded conscientious fellow—but as little possessed of tact or common sense as he is great in other departments. He had to take my Church in my absence ; I had not been one Sunday from Oxford till lately since October 1838. I had cautioned him against extravagances in St. Mary's Pulpit, as he had given some specimens in that line once before. What does he do on St. Michael's day but preach a Sermon, not simply on Angels, but on his one subject for which he has a monomania, of fasting, nay and say it was a good thing, whereas Angels feasted on festivals, to make the brute creation fast on fast days. So I am told—May he (*salvis ossibus suis*) have a fasting horse the next time he goes steeple chasing. Well this was not all. You may conceive how the Heads of Houses, Cardwell, Gilbert etc. fretted under this—but next Sunday he gave them a more extended exhibition *si quid posset*. He preached to them *totidem verbis* the Roman doctrine of the Mass, and, not content with that, added in energetic terms that every one was an unbeliever, carnal, and so forth, who did not hold it. To this he added other speculations of his own, still more objectionable. This was too much for any V.C.—In consequence he was had up before him—his sermon officially examined, and he formally admonished, and the Bishop written to. Thus the matter stands at present. The Bp. is to read his sermon—and I have been obliged to give my judgment on it to him—which is not favorable, nor can be. I don't suppose much more will be done but it is very unpleasant. The worst part is that the V.C. has not said a single word to me, good or bad, and has taken away his family from St. Mary's. I cannot but hope he will have the good sense to see that this is a mistake. I wish *all* this kept secret, please, for it is not known even here.

Matthison has just called on me. It seems that the Bp. of London is intriguing to hinder the Church Catechism from being a *sine qua non* in the National Schools, and that the Bp. of Exeter in another way is playing so strange a game, people cannot make out what he is at.

The waters are rising so fast, that though they destroy the Church Catechism I think the *ἡθoς* of it will come in with the schoolmasters, whoever they are. Jeffreys is appointed training Master of the Gloucester School, and Wilson is to be of the London—but so strong an opposition is being made by Mr. Close, that it is feared it will end in both of them withdrawing. I am almost sorry you hindered Lewis from accepting the Oxford Mastership (if it was you) as we want one badly.

The authorities of this place are said to have returned very much frightened about the spread of Apostolicity,—but they cannot stop matters now. The only fear is of persons going too far. You should read the late article in the *Dublin*—it is the best thing Dr. Wiseman has put out. It is paralleling the English Church to the Donatists and certainly the parallel is very curious—the only question is whether Augustine's notions are Catholic on this point—he certainly does seem to make for Dr. W.—The papers say that the question of mixed marriages is coming on in Russia—and that the Emperor has sent off the Catholic Clergy to Siberia. Other accounts (improbable) are that 4,000,000 Catholics have gone over to the Greek Church. There was a curious document in the papers the other day in the shape of a firman of the Porte—I was struck by observing that it called the Romans and not the Greeks Catholics. . . .

J. H. NEWMAN TO S. F. WOOD, Esq.

Oriel : November 10, 1839.

My dear Wood,—I have stupidly written the enclosed on half a sheet, and have so miserably written it that you will be plagued by reading it. But, please, read it—and *if* you think it advisable, send it on.

I don't know what to do about the direction not knowing where R.W. is. I direct it at a shot—and the people in Birchin Lane can redirect it. I would leave it to you, but I am not sure how far you would like to appear in the matter.

I heartily wish you were better and stronger in health. I congratulate you on your Anti-Erastian hit. People are getting stronger you see without knowing it. Soon they will be swimming in hot water—and it will do no good to say 'Take me out,' when parboiled.

The steam is getting up here. By bad luck some one (Morris) in my absence has been preaching the Roman Mass (by accident) in my pulpit—by bad luck the V.C. heard it, and he has taken it [up] officially and reported it to the Bishop. This is a secret. Two of our 'House' or 'Hall' men have just got on foundations, to my great satisfaction—Pattison and Christie. The former would not have stayed up in Oxford but for the House. And but for it I should not have known the second. We are somewhat scant of inhabitants at this moment.

Faber of Magdalen has been chosen by V.C. to preach Guy Fawkes Sermon, as being a moderate man; and he has preached in favour of the Apostolical movement<sup>1</sup> and defended praying for the dead, or at least those who prayed.

The Provost is hard at his Bampton, meanwhile—and 'hushed in grim repose, expects his evening prey.'

Ever yrs. affectionately,

J. H. N.

The 'House' or 'Hall' referred to in the above letter was a house taken by Pusey or Newman, where young men who had taken their degree could reside. They lived in common, rent free, each, however, paying a small sum for his board. They were employed on the Library of the Fathers and other literary projects connected with the movement. Newman, in a letter to Bowden thanking him for a donation to the house, jokingly calls the inmates 'our young monks.' J. B. Mozley in one of his letters described it as a 'reading and collating establishment.' It was a short-lived institution, for it closed when the last inmate, J. B. Mozley, was elected fellow of Magdalen in 1840.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I.e. The Tractarian Movement.

<sup>2</sup> *Newman's Life and Correspondence*, by Miss Mozley, i. 223; Pusey's *Life &c.* i. 339; Mark Pattison's *Memoirs*, pp. 180 ff.; *Letters of J. B. Mozley*, pp. 78 and 94.

'When I got back to Oxford in October 1839, it so happened there had been occurrences of an awkward character, compromising me both with my Bishop, and also with the authorities of the University' ('Apologia,' pp. 127-8). One of these 'occurrences' must have been Mr. Morris's sermons on the Mass and on Fasting; another was 'Bloxam's Escapade.'<sup>1</sup>

On Nov. 18 the Rev. W. Dodsworth wrote to Newman to the following effect. He had heard in Staffordshire that Newman's curate, Mr. Bloxam, when on a visit to Dr. Rock at Alton Towers, had attended service in a Romish chapel, and like other worshippers bowed down at the elevation of the Host. So many falsehoods on such matters were reported that his natural instinct would be to discredit the story though it came to him on what seemed good authority. So great a departure from what is 'Catholic,' and even 'honourable' in a clergyman of the Church of England should not be believed except on the admission of the person implicated. The writer had to confess to some alarm at the feelings manifested in certain quarters. Some young men seemed almost prepossessed in favour of Romanism. It reminded him of the feeling prevalent among the Low Church clergy a few years ago, that the nearer they approached to dissenting methods the better. Of course he did not speak of his fears to others, but he felt that he might do so to Newman.

John Rouse Bloxam lived on till 1891, so all reference to his 'escapade' was omitted in Miss Mozley's 'Letters and Correspondence of Cardinal Newman' published in 1890. But the editors of the present volume do not feel that they are showing any want of respect to the memory of one of Newman's staunchest friends by bringing it to light now, when people are more likely to be amused at the fuss which was made over the affair than shocked at its happening. Perhaps Mr. Bloxam during the years 1840-1845 was somewhat of an extremist, for he is found corresponding with Phillipps de Lisle on the subject of Reunion. If such he was, he only illustrates the fact that many of these extremists eventually settled down as Anglicans.

Mr. Dodsworth, on the other hand, who became a Catholic in 1851 after the Gorham Trial, may be taken to

<sup>1</sup> This is how Newman in later years docketed his correspondence with the Bishop of Oxford on this subject.



illustrate the corresponding fact that the majority of the converts were not men who in their Anglican days had said or done very startling things.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. W. DODSWORTH

Oriel College : November 19, 1839

My dear Mr. Dodsworth,—I hasten to answer your friendly letter, and in a way less satisfactory than your kindness would desire, yet better than my own fears.

I was aware Mr. Bloxam had been at Lord Shrewsbury's; the idea that he had bowed down at the elevation of the Host had not entered my mind for an instant, tho' he told me he had been in the Chapel.

On the receipt of your letter I went and asked him about it. He gives me the following account which I have taken down from his mouth.

'I went into the Gallery of the Chapel every day morning and evening and said there our Morning and Evening Service for the day according to our Book of Common Prayer. After Morning Service I used to stay some time on my knees, during which the family came in and had Service in which I took no part. This Service, on the Friday, and the Friday only, was Low Mass; in which I took no part either, but remained just as on other days without changing my posture.'

I did not think to ask him, but no doubt, had I done so, he would have added, 'I had no intention whatever of bowing down to the Host.'

In consequence of your letter, I have written to our Bishop—quoting without your name your words, and Mr. Bloxam's explanation as given above.

Of course this is a very unpleasant occurrence, but I fear that I must expect some or other in one or other quarter for some little while. I fully sympathise in what you say about the temper of some younger men. I suppose the case is simply this, that we have raised desires, of which our Church does not supply the objects, and that they have not the patience, or humility, or discretion to keep from seeking

those objects where they are supplied. I have from the first thought that nothing but a *quasi* miracle, would carry us through the trial with no proselytes whatever to Rome—and, though I shall fairly have to bear my share in them, shall not feel surprise, nor I trust self-reproach at what is not my doing.

I am truly sorry to hear you have passed through Oxford, and I away. I have been away only a week at one time, and a fortnight at another since Christmas.

Yours very sincerely,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

### J. H. NEWMAN TO THE BISHOP OF OXFORD

November 19, '39.

My dear Lord,—I feel much grieved to have to trouble your Lordship so soon again on an unpleasant subject,<sup>1</sup> which I find myself obliged to do.

I received this morning a letter from a friend in London containing the following enquiry :

‘When I was in Staffordshire this Autumn I heard on what appeared to me unquestionable authority that your Curate, Mr. Bloxam, when on a visit to Dr. Rock at Alton Towers, had attended a service at the Romish Chapel, in which, like the other worshippers he bowed down at the Elevation of the Host.’

I accordingly have inquired of Mr. Bloxam, who, I was aware has been at Lord Shrewsbury’s in the summer, and he gives me the following account which I have written down from his mouth.

‘I went into the gallery of the Chapel every day, morning and evening and said there our Morning and Evening Service for the day according to our Book of Common Prayer. After Morning Service I used to stay sometime on my knees, during which the family came in and had Service in which I took no part. This service, on the Friday and Friday only, was Low Mass in which I took no part either, but

<sup>1</sup> There must have been some correspondence on the Morris affair.

remained just as on other days without changing my position.'

I do not know what I have to say more than this, to bring what to me is a very distressing occurrence before your Lordship, and am etc.

J. H. N.

#### THE BISHOP OF OXFORD TO J. H. NEWMAN

November 25, 1839.

My dear Sir,—I much regret the information which you felt obliged to give me in your letter of the 19th, respecting your Curate, Mr. Bloxam.

I feel, however, that it is a matter at present resting between yourselves.

If from any apprehension of Mr. Bloxam really having a propensity towards Romanism, or from the great indiscretion he appears to have shown at Alton Towers, you think he has acted in a manner unbecoming a Minister of our Protestant Church, and therefore as one whom you could not with comfort to yourself, employ as your Curate, the proposal of separation should come from yourself, and it would only be in the event of your Curate's *refusal* to resign his Curacy that the Bishop's aid or interference would be necessary.

Believe me,

My dear sir, faithfully yours,

R. OXFORD.

P.S. I shall be at Canterbury to-night.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO THE BISHOP OF OXFORD

December 9, 1839.

My dear Lord,—I am very sorry to find from Dr. Pusey that I have been careless enough to misunderstand your Lordship's note in answer to mine on the subject of Mr. Bloxam, and that you are expecting an answer from me. I write at once to apologise for it.

Understanding that your Lordship did not intend to take up the case yourself, and since I had no view myself of Mr. B.'s conduct but that it was an unfortunate indiscretion (which is your Lordship's view of it) and one which I was sure would not be repeated, I thought the matter was at an end.

I brought it before your Lordship simply because I did not like anything to happen connected with St. Mary's of a certain character at the present time, without your being put at once in possession of the facts. I wish to look on myself as merely your Lordship's delegate in the parish, not mentioning indeed common occurrences for that would be giving your Lordship trouble which it is my very business to take from one who has the care of so many Churches, but not letting anything pass which I think you would like to know. I ought to have reflected that I had not yet expressed my own opinion of the occurrence and that you seemed to ask it.

I did not write to your Lordship from any annoyance of feeling with Mr. B., and I did so with his full concurrence. I am much attached to him (two words illegible). I have no serious fault to find with him, though I much regret the conduct in question. He is a most valuable Curate to me.

He shall write to your Lordship himself and he will both gladly and cheerfully submit to whatever you think fit to be done.

Yours etc.,

J. H. N.

#### THE BISHOP OF OXFORD TO J. H. NEWMAN

Blithfield : December 26, 1839.

My dear Sir,—It is long since the receipt of your last letter, and I did not at first think it required an answer, at least, not an immediate one, although there were points upon which I should have wished some time or another to remark.

Shortly after I heard from Mr. Bloxam himself, and to

that letter I have as yet sent no reply, for I have really for sometime past been hampered by so great a pressure of business that I have had no leisure. A note from Dr. Pusey, on Sunday night last, informed me that Mr. Bloxam's late indiscretion, and my disapprobation, were preying upon his mind. I now therefore take the first opportunity since I left Oxford of recurring to the subject.

With regard to Mr. Bloxam, although I think he might have given a more detailed explanation than his short letter contains, I am quite willing to consider his feeling and expression of sorrow for what took place at Alton Towers, as tantamount to a recorded assurance that nothing similar either there or elsewhere, shall occur again. Had it occurred in my own Diocese, or had it been more generally known, my present course would have been less easy—and here, my dear Sir, let me entreat you to exert your own high and influential name among a numerous body of the Clergy, and young men destined for orders who look up to you,—to discourage by every means in your power indiscretions similar to Mr. Bloxam's, or any little extravagances, the results of youth,—harmless perhaps in themselves, but which, I am sure, when they occur, and are known, tend to retard the progress of sound and high Church principles which you would inculcate. You will I feel confident forgive my speaking so frankly on this head.

And now with regard to your last letter to me on the subject, you must allow me to say a few words, because I think you have rather mistaken the rule on which an Incumbent should act, in regard to referring matters to his Diocesan. He ought, I conceive, to make up his mind with respect to cases which may occur, to the best of his judgement, and to be prepared to render an account of his proceedings to the Bishop if called on, but it seems hardly fair to throw the responsibility of acting or not on the Bishop, when the Incumbent has already determined in his own mind what course he should take. If such a practice were general, what a burden would be thrown on the Bishop, more especially as his judgements must be formed on the

statements submitted to him by the Incumbent, and this in regard to matters on which he might afterwards be required to decide as Judge. I am led to this statement of my opinion by the expression in your letter that you wished to look upon yourself merely as my delegate in the parish.

After this letter I, perhaps, need hardly write to Mr. Bloxam, at the same time should it be any relief to his mind that I should, I will, upon hearing from you or himself, do so.

Believe me, etc.

R. OXFORD.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO THE BISHOP OF OXFORD

Oriel : January 5, 1840.

My dear Lord,—Mr. Bloxam joins with me in thanking you very much for your kind letter. I have waited to acknowledge it, hoping he would have enclosed a note from himself. But the plain fact is that he is in a very delicate state of health, to say the least, and this occurrence has quite upset him. He has made an attempt to write to your Lordship, but could not please himself. I think it will end, much against my wish, in his retiring from the charge of Littlemore.

I can assure your Lordship that my efforts neither are, nor have been, wanting in keeping younger men from the indiscretions to which you allude; but I feel obliged by being reminded of the duty of making them.

I will do in future as your Lordship wishes about bringing things before your Lordship which happen in my parish. As the Archdeacon advised me to write to you at once on the subject of Mr. Morris before having heard from you I thought you would wish me to do so in like manner now. I knew your Lordship was in Staffordshire, I thought you were very likely to hear the report, and would wish to know what the state of the case was. I did not know (I say it quite unaffectedly) whether your Lordship's view of the

matter would be the same as I took myself. I was prepared to act on your Lordship's whatever it might be, I did not like to give my own uncalled for. I had not the most distant intention of relieving myself of responsibility.

Yours etc.

J. H. N.

#### THE BISHOP OF OXFORD TO J. H. NEWMAN

Blithfield : Monday, January 6 [1840].

My dear Sir,—I must trouble you with one more line to thank you for your letter received this morning, and to request you will beg Mr. Bloxam to dismiss from his mind all idea of the necessity of writing to me ; I am quite satisfied, and very much regret to find this business has had so uncomfortable an effect upon his health and spirits.

With regard to yourself My dear Sir, I trust you did not in any degree misunderstand my letter. I stated what I conceived to be the ordinary rule respecting the course between an Incumbent and Diocesan in cases where it might be necessary to act, but be assured it will always give me pleasure to hear from you, and to have the most unreserved of friendly communications.

I am, Dear Sir,

Faithfully yours,

R. OXFORD.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO J. W. BOWDEN, Esq.

Oriel College : January 5, 1840.

My dear Bowden,—The best wishes of this season and the New Year to you and all yours. I have had two letters from you, for which I am much obliged, and the account they give is very satisfactory. May He who has helped us hitherto, lead us on still.

I followed Johnson's instructions implicitly about the direction of my letter. I now will follow yours. I hoped to have written before this, but have been very busy.

I believe I did not tell you the sequel of the Morris affair. The V.C. (very kindly in manner) officially admonished him. There you would suppose the matter would end. But not so. Against the rule of the Canons a *double* punishment was inflicted for the same offence. The V.C. wrote to the Bishop, who wrote to me; and then came a letter (very kind) from the Bishop to Morris, and that *at last* ended the affair. But since that a worse matter has risen; which I think I have this very day closed in a letter to the Bp. at least I hope so. Dodsworth in the beginning of November wrote to ask me whether it was true that Bloxam my Curate had paid a visit to Alton Towers (Lord Shrewsbury's) and had there attended Mass, and prostrated himself at the elevation of the Host with the other worshippers. I knew that he had been to Ld. S's and he had told me, with some misgivings that he had been into the Chapel—so this frightened me much. On asking him about it he gave me this (*in re mala*) satisfactory account. 'I went into the gallery of the Chapel morning and evening to say the Prayers for the day from our *Common Prayer Book*. After going through them, I used to remain some time on my knees. In the course of this latter time, the family came in and service was performed. On the Friday was Low Mass. I took no part whatever in it, but remained in the posture I was as before.' He seems to have gone to the Chapel as a Consecrated place when there was no other place to go to. But it [was] very indiscreet certainly. I thought it best at once to write to the Bp., who has done nothing, but is scarcely pleased at my having brought the matter before him. Bloxam is sadly cut up and has let it prey on his mind. I suppose it will end in his giving up the Curacy, much against my will. He quite agreed with me that the Bp. ought to be written to. All this is not known in Oxford, but I have expected to see it continually in the *Record* or *Christian Observer*. But so many lies have been told about us that even they perhaps will be tired of believing it.

The said *Observer* has got milder lately. I suppose it



finds it is overshooting the mark. Mr. Taylor,<sup>1</sup> I think, is destroying himself and his cause by proving too much. I have not read his fasciculi yet, but I see he talks of the Nicene Fathers having the brand of Apostacy on their foreheads. It is curious to find that the lawyers and laity do not take to Mr. Taylor but the Clergy do—for why? because the doctrine of celibacy touches the latter much more closely. Put aside all Mr. Taylor's gross misrepresentations, this is the real hitch at bottom. Mr. Todd's 'Sermons on Anti-Christ' etc., have at last appeared, and seem to be both bold and seasonable. Not Mr. Taylor, but Dr. Wiseman seems taking the lawyers—so I hear. Indeed his last article comparing us to the Donatists has taken in quarters where I should not have expected it would excite an interest. Indeed he has fixed on our weak point, as Keble's Sermon, Manning's Rule of Faith, and my Lectures on *his*. (By-the-bye they none of them have attempted an answer to this part of the subject.) It is plainly necessary to stop up the leak in our boat which he has made, if we are to proceed. This I have attempted to *begin* to do in an article in the January *B.C.* on the 'Catholicity of the English Church.'

The new volumes of the 'Remains'<sup>2</sup> are selling excellently. The preface by Keble is much liked. I suppose we shall have *Fraser's Magazine* picking out what it will call disloyalty and sedition. Old Faussett started half off his seat when he heard of new volumes, as if he should say 'Why, I annihilated Mr. F.'s writings last year—what is meant by the absurdity of continuing them?'

I am publishing the 'Church of the Fathers.' It makes me very anxious. I have not put my name to any *strong* thing yet—and this is regularly strong meat. I suppose I must expect a clamour, unless persons are tired of clamouring.

<sup>1</sup> Author of *Ancient Christianity and the Doctrines of the Oxford Tracts for the Times*—published in parts 1839–1842: and of *Spiritual Despotism*.

<sup>2</sup> *I.e.* the second part of Froude's *Remains*.

Mr. Spencer the R.C. Priest is coming here to-morrow on a visit to Palmer of Magdalen. Those men, who are not called 'the party,' may do anything. Dr. Rock was here not long since, and Hamilton fêted him. But then *he* is not one of the party either.

Pusey is at Brighton ; his children are not at all better. He is pretty well, at present he is very much bent on establishing an order of Sisters of Mercy, (I despair somehow, but I always croak) and is collecting information.

At this point, where Newman put aside his letter for three days, something may be said about Dr. Todd's 'Sermons,' or, to give them their proper title, 'Discourses on the Prophecies relating to Antichrist,' &c., and why they were 'bold and seasonable.' Dr. Todd allied himself with Dean Maitland in England in attacking the prevailing opinion, over which the Protestant world was, perhaps, more nearly unanimous than upon anything else, that the Church of Rome was the communion of Antichrist. It would be a mistake to regard this grotesque and horrible idea as a mere curiosity of polemical literature. For centuries it was fervently believed in, and lived up to ; perhaps nowhere more than in Ireland. It was still in possession in 1840, and real courage was required to attack it. Newman had imbibed it in his youth, and, so he tells us, it stained his imagination for a long time after it lost its hold upon his intellect. He had, of course, abandoned it long before 1840 ; but he recognised that it was a real obstacle to the spread of Tractarian principles. For this reason he welcomed Dr. Todd's 'Discourses,' and made them the basis of an article in the *British Critic* on the 'Protestant Idea of Antichrist.'<sup>1</sup> Maitland and Todd traced the idea back to the disreputable sources in the Middle Ages, from which the Reformers derived it. Newman only went back a few years. Who had revived the idea, when it was growing obsolete, and given it a new lease of life ? This fearful duty of once more fixing the seal of perdition on the greater part of Christendom seemed to have fallen to a very amiable, but exceedingly comfort-loving and preferment-hunting eighteenth-century bishop, 'whose most fervent aspiration (as revealed in his frank and

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted in *Essays Crit. and Hist.* vol. ii.

engaging autobiography) apparently was that he might ride in a carriage and sleep on down, whose keenest sorrow was that he could not get a second appointment without relinquishing the first, who cast a regretful look back at his dinner while he was at supper, and anticipated his morning chocolate in his evening muffins.' There was a great deal in the article of a more serious character than the sketch of Bishop Newton ; but nothing that was so likely to stick in the memory of its readers. It must have been a relief to many persons who had been brought up in Evangelical homes to learn that they were free to consider the tenet in question on its own intrinsic merits, without being overawed by the grave and reverend character of its champions.

LETTER TO J. W. BOWDEN, Esq., *continued*

Jan. 8.—Mr. Spencer called on me to-day under the following circumstances. He had come it seems to Oxford to see us, and Palmer had asked me to dine to meet him. I considered, however, that he was *in loco apostatae*, one who had done despite to our orders etc., etc., so I declined, giving that reason, namely that I could have no *familiar* or *social* intercourse with him. After various remonstrances, and fruitless plans on Palmer's part, Palmer asked whether I should object to his calling on me. I said that I had no right to entertain the idea of putting him to that inconvenience, but if he would, I should be glad to see him. So he came with P. and sat with me an hour. I wish these R.C. priests had not so smooth a manner, it puts me out. He was very mild, very gentlemanlike, not a controversialist, and came to insist only on one point, that we would take steps to get Anglo-catholics to pray for the R.C.'s. He said he was sure that if we felt the desirableness of unity, and if we prayed for each other, where there was a will there would be a way, etc., etc. He said that he had been instrumental in beginning the practice in France, that it had spread all over that country, and was now being taken up in Germany—Thursday being the day fixed on. It is

certainly a most dreadful thing that we should be separated from them—but your account of the Southern Churches, makes one almost feel as if a formal union would do no good. If we could make strong terms with them so as to *act upon* them, that would be the thing. He called on Routh and had a similar talk with him.

Since I began this letter I have had a most kind letter from our Bishop in answer to mine, which has put Bloxam in good spirits—but I think it will still end in his ultimately retiring from Littlemore. Thank you for the £50, which I will lay out in the best way I can, as you shall hear.

They say there is no doubt the Conservatives are coming in—the Bp. of Exeter says, before the end of 3 months. He says also that they will be out by the end of 6 years, and a radical Government succeed them—and that their business meanwhile is to ‘make way,’ and to do all they can to meet the storm, as by building Churches, etc., etc. *The Quarterly*, you will see, is persisting in its Apostolical, though cold, tone.

You know Reginald Copleston (of Exeter College) a very good fellow, is to be the new incumbent of Barnes; the Dean of St. Paul’s presenting him. Mr. Close and Co. of Cheltenham clamoured so much about H. Jeffreys’ appointment to the training school at Gloucester that he was obliged, though appointed by the Bp. to withdraw. Well I hear to-day that at last they have got a young fellow of Lincoln, of the name of Atkinson, *who is one of our translators*<sup>1</sup>! In like manner they refused Copeland *here*, and have got a man who (*ex abundantia cautela*) had been a semi-Bulteelite—but who it turns out is now rapidly coming on to Apostolical opinions. In London they are still unprovided. (They say the Bp. of London is warning about us.) To return to Lincoln, after rejecting James Mozley for a fellowship two years since for his opinions, they have been taken in by Pattison this last term, an inmate of the Cœnobitium. He happened to stand very suddenly and they had no time to inquire. They now stare in amazement at their feat.

<sup>1</sup> For the *Library of the Fathers*.

Christie too another of our inmates, has been elected off on the Mitchell Foundation Queen's—so we are run short of monks, and hardly know what to do.

Thank you for your amusing account of your Italian friend. Kindest thoughts of the season to Mrs. Bowden and the children.

Ever yrs. affly.,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. W. BOWDEN, Esq.

Oriel College : February 21, 1840.

My dear Bowden,—I will not let the day pass over, without showing you, what you will not doubt, that I am thinking of you upon it, and that I wish to repay the kind thoughts which I know you are giving me. Your last letter was a very comfortable one about yourself, and I hope you continue to go on as well as it promised.

I have got into a desponding way about the state of things, and I don't know why quite. Right principles are progressing doubtless, but it seems as if they were working up to a collision with Puritanism, which may split the Church. I fear the Bps. are not so favorable: but one fancies. What I said in my last was that the Bp. of L. wavered about us, which was good—but I have lately heard that the Bp. of Ripon was about to show some distrust in *τοῖς περὶ* Hook. But this is a secret—also I am not quite sure that Hook himself is not getting frightened; but this is another. Here, the authorities are getting more and more cold and averse, I fear—though it may be fancy in me to say so. I fear too that some persons will turn Roman Catholics, up and down the country; indeed how is this possibly to be helped as things are? they will be right in their major and wrong only in their minor—right in their principles, wrong in their fact—they seek the true Church, but do not recognise the Church in us.

As to Bloxam you must not be hard upon him—he is an exceedingly good fellow. He has been so annoyed at this,

that it quite preyed on his mind, and I fear for his health, for he is in a very delicate state—he has given up Littlemore, and Copeland is to be my Curate, i.e. during Lent. I am going up to lodge there to see how things are going on.

I like your idea of an article on the position of our Church in the Mediterranean very much—but perhaps I have apprehensions of a suffragan at Malta. You see even the Christian Knowledge Society has shown a disposition to meddle with the foreign Churches, to substitute our Liturgy for theirs, etc., etc. I hardly see how a Bp. at Malta could escape this. On all sides our misery is this, that we have not the Catholic *ἡθος*—in consequence, one dare not hardly *move*—there is almost a certainty of some absurdity or sin being the consequence. This feeling has almost made me despondent and sluggish—as if nothing *could* be done. Pusey at present is very eager about setting up Sisters of Mercy. I feel sure that such institutions are the only means of saving some of our best members turning Roman Catholics, and yet I despair of such societies being *much* externally. They must be the expansion of an inward principle. All one can do is to offer the opportunity. I am sceptical too whether they can be set up without a *quasi* vow.

As to Dr. Wiseman's article I do not think you have hit the point of it. It made a very great impression here, and to say, what of course I would only say to such as yourself, it made me for a while very uncomfortable in my own mind. He maintains first that the present *look* of Christendom is such, that St. Austin or St. Basil coming among us would say at once '*That* is the Catholic Church—and *those* are the heretics,' meaning Rome and us respectively—and next the said Fathers and all the Fathers teach that that '*look*' of things was ever meant to be a providential note, in order to *save* argument; without going into the question who excommunicates, when, etc., etc., I frankly confess I cannot deny either of his positions—that the Fathers *would* at *first sight* so judge of us—or that they *did* so teach. My article was to meet this, and I am glad to hear in many quarters that it has done good service. But the great

speciousness of his argument is one of the things which have made me despond so much. My 'Church of the Fathers' is now finished, and, I suppose, will be out in the course of a week. It is in *duodecimo* but far too thick—about 400 pages, which are equal to oct<sup>vo</sup> pages. It is the prettiest book I have done—which is not wonderful, being hardly more than the words and works of the Fathers. Good part of it is translation and abstract. I have no notion how it will take, as I have been obliged to give out the Fathers' views about celibacy and miraculous power.

The Duke of Wellington is said certainly to be breaking up—and the Wintle<sup>1</sup> party are already canvassing for the Duke of Buckingham as Chancellor. Which will be miserable but the chance is they are successful as [*some words illegible*] were in the poor Duke's case. What a wonderful thing it is, and what a strange reproach to the nation that for the last ten years the Duke should have done nothing. Considering his great influence with European Powers, it is like infatuation that the country should not have availed itself of what will never come again; it was part of our purchase by twenty years of bloodshed, and now it is thrown away. Dukes of Wellington are not to be had for the asking. Is it not sad what the papers say of the Queen? when she is wiser, she will repent when nothing remains of the Duke but his name.

I was told that Mr. Spencer expressed himself quite puzzled why I would not dine with him; so I wrote him a letter about a fortnight since, which he has not answered, perhaps from fear of getting into controversy. I merely said, that it was useless for them to attempt amicable intercourse between themselves and us, while their *acts* were contrary, while they allied themselves to Dissenters and Infidels, and were plotting our ruin—the voice was Jacob's voice, but the hands were the hands of Esau; that he did not come as an individual R.C. but as a priest, on a religious purpose, etc., etc.

Ward of Trinity has been trapped by Mr. Sewell of

<sup>1</sup> [This word is not quite certain.]

Magdalen (apropos of the publication of the Magdalen Statutes) into the absurd step of sending the latter a challenge. Mr. S. seems to me to have behaved very badly—Ward very well, after the first step. He has apologised &c., &c., in the fullest way. The matter is before the V.C. who gives his judgment to-morrow. The University Punishment is *bannitio*, but no one can tell what *bannitio* means. *Amotio* is expulsion, and the idea of rusticating a man who is living at Headington does not seem satisfactory. I am going up to Littlemore in about 10 days. Our Provost's Bamptons have not begun. We are having bitter frosts, the glass 30 in my room when there is not a fire. They are very acceptable; the wet has been excessive. Kindest thoughts to all yours.

Ever yrs. affly.,  
J. H. N.

From this time Newman began more and more to reside at Littlemore. He threw himself into the work of catechising the village children, and seems to have been extraordinarily successful in it. But this phase of his life has been fully described in Miss Mozley's 'Letters and Correspondence,' &c.

G. R. M. Ward of Trinity, who must not be confused with W. G. Ward of Balliol, the author of the 'Ideal,' &c., was a man of pronounced views and of a combative disposition. He was also smarting under the sense of a personal grievance, for he had been obliged to relinquish his Fellowship on his refusal to take Orders. In 1839 he had published a ferocious pamphlet under the title of 'An Appeal to the Bishop of Winchester, Visitor of Trinity College, Oxford, on the Misappropriation of the Endowments of that Society, with Hints towards a History of the "Poor Man's Church in Oxford."' The 'Appeal' was followed up by a translation of the 'Statutes of Magdalen College,' intended to be the first of a series of similar translations, which would be the means of 'enabling public opinion, no less than the consciences of interested individuals, to canvass the question how far any aberrations of practice (i.e. departures from the intentions of Founders) are justified or unallowable under the changes of times and manners.'



Mr. Ward's zeal for the 'Intentions of Founders' proved infectious, and he was accused of violating them by publishing the Statutes.<sup>1</sup>

It is difficult to imagine Mr. Ward and Newman having anything in common. Nothing would be more repugnant to the feelings of the latter than the idea of the colleges being summoned before the tribunal of public opinion, this said public opinion being informed by translations of Statutes without note or comment. Nevertheless the two men seem to have been good friends. Newman did not wish people to be too hard on Mr. Ward, and Mr. Ward, even in his most truculent moods, would go out of his way to express his admiration for Newman.

Mr. Ward's grievance was that Fellowships and Scholarships were lavished upon men already possessing a competency instead of being reserved for indigent students. He does not seem to have troubled himself much with the religious ideals of the Founders. The Tractarians and their friends wished to go back to the Intentions of Founders in religious matters also. A movement in the direction of conservative reform, in which James Hope took a leading part, had already been initiated at Merton. Newman must have thought that the translation of the Magdalen Statutes was a good opportunity for calling attention to the question, for he suggested to Mr. Hope that he should make them the subject of an article in some magazine.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

Jan. 31, 1840.—I was exceedingly pleased and obliged by your prompt answer. Whether your article appears in *Quarterly* or *British Critic*<sup>2</sup> is a matter for your own judgment. It depends on *what* your article is to be, and whether the *Quarterly* likes to meddle with the subject. As to my own notion it would be this: that the subject of our

<sup>1</sup> According to Mr. Ward's own account, in his preface to his translation of the *Statutes of All Souls*, published in 1841, his version of the *Statutes of Magdalen* was attacked 'both as a breach of the law of the land, and as a work at variance with a good conscience.' He goes on to recount how the authorities of Magdalen attempted legal proceedings against him, which broke down at a very early stage.

<sup>2</sup> Newman was editor of the *British Critic*.

Statutes was at this moment uninteresting to the *Quarterly's* public, and that there has lately been a review in the *Q.* on the subject, whereas the public one wishes to interest was the University and clerical public, viz. to put words in their mouths against assailants, and to suggest hints to those whom it concerned. And now you know my meaning you shall decide.

I do not think your anticipating your book<sup>1</sup> is of any consequence. I should have thought it would interest persons in the subject, and prepare them for your book. And I could have fancied it might have improved your book. Both these effects have taken place in *my own* experience. But you are judge.

As to time I have no right to be strict. . . . Let me repeat my thanks. You put it to me to say whether the object is important. I cannot help thinking it is, now that Magdalen<sup>2</sup> wishes to move, and will be a *precedent* to other bodies—yet one does not like to take the responsibility of saying so. Is it not important?

Ever yours, etc.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

Feb. 3, 1840.—I was pleased to think that R. Palmer was likely to have a share in your work, or rather sure. There can be no doubt I suppose, that *he* would feel it *desirable* to *reform*. It seems to me a great point to try to bring persons to contemplate the possibility of coming back to the Statutes, and not to rule it that conformity is impossible, as people are so apt to do. All things must have a beginning—therefore it does not follow that literal obedience must at once be attempted, because it is desirable.

As to Wilberforce he seems deep in the subject, and is unwilling to part with the books. *He must*, of course, if they cannot be purchased in London. . . .

You must not be *severe* with Ward. He is a contemporary of mine at Trinity, a fellow scholar, and does me the unmerited honour of thinking me one of the few

<sup>1</sup> Mr. Hope was preparing a book *On Colleges*. He never published it.

<sup>2</sup> Can Magdalen be a slip of the pen for Merton?

Catos or Scipios in the University. So it would be most ungrateful in me to attack him. And besides, he really has a number of good points.

Yours very truly, etc.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

My dear Hope,—Bandinel tells me as follows:—‘It is not a Laudian MS.,<sup>1</sup> but came into the Bodleian Library among Rawlinson’s Collections. It is certainly official, tho’ it cannot be ascertained from what quarter it was stolen; I say official, because it has some documents subsequent to the Foundation added to it, and regularly attested by a Notary Public.’ He thinks it of greater authority, if I understand him right, than any other copy. The College (I think he said) had lost their original, and so had the Visitor. He showed it to me; and it seemed of very considerable age. There are corrections upon it, as if it had been compared with some other copy.

I am obliged to you for the trouble you are taking. . . . As to your suggestion, long ago many of my friends have been desirous of a Clerical Chancellor, etc.

Newman then goes on to discuss Mr. Hope’s idea of a Clerical Chancellor. He was evidently much taken with it, and suggested the Bishop of Salisbury; but not without hesitation. ‘I should be afraid that one would never know where to find the Bishop.’ He was ‘a man to put forward and patronise men much less sound than himself.’ It has not been thought worth while to print this portion of the letter. Projects which were never realised have little interest, except so far as they illustrate, like the hopes of bringing back the Colleges to the ideals of their Founders, how full of confidence and enterprise the Tractarians were before the catastrophe over Tract 90. The freedom with which Newman in this and other letters unbosoms himself to Mr. Hope and the confidence which he already had in his judgment are striking. Mr. Hope was his junior by more than ten years; and their friendship had only just begun.

The postscript to the above letter is a trifle which seems worth preserving.

<sup>1</sup> The MS. of the Magdalen Statutes which Mr. Ward had used.

P.S.—Rogers was going quietly to bed, when Eden, who had already been knocked down once, came and begged him and Church to consent to be knocked down again with him. It was late at night—the *young men* had left the street—the Proctors were retiring. Accordingly they went out, were surrounded by the mob, thrashed soundly with bludgeons, and came in again. There was literally no one object, either assignable or accomplished, for their going out, except that of being knocked down.

On February the 21st, and again on the 25th Newman wrote to Hope discussing the question of the Chancellorship. Pusey was against the Bishop of Salisbury, and the merits of other Bishops were discussed. On March 7 Newman received the proofs of the article on the Magdalen Statutes. Mr. Hope had been very *severe* on Ward.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

March 7, 1840.

Your parcel just come. Many thanks indeed for the great trouble you have taken. I am on the point of setting off to Littlemore, where, Bloxam being at home from his father's illness, I shall be some weeks. I shall send your paper to the press forthwith. . . . I have looked through it. It seems very good and interesting. You are severe on Ward, but you are a better judge than I am of the necessity of being so. I shall see it in proof as well as you—and will suggest if there is any minor alteration necessary.

On March 13 Newman again wrote to Mr. Hope. He wished in his editorial capacity to say something to soften the effect of Mr. Hope's strictures on Mr. Ward. On March 19, having carefully studied Mr. Hope's article, he wrote to him praising it most enthusiastically.<sup>1</sup> The article was published in the April number of the *British Critic*.

The last was not yet heard of Mr. Ward. To Newman in his capacity of editor of the *British Critic* he wrote a letter which was too indignant for publication. Newman replied in the next number and had to make a concession

<sup>1</sup> See *Memoirs of J. R. Hope-Scott*, vol. i. p. 190.

upon one point which Mr. Ward had a right to regard as important. He had to admit that a passage in which the Founder seemed to prohibit the publication of his Statutes *might* admit of Mr. Ward's interpretation, and refer, not to the Statutes, but to other documents. Mr. Ward replied the following year in his preface to a translation of the 'Statutes of All Souls.' He was rejoiced 'to find that there is no ground, save matter of mere opinion, for a dispute between himself and a gentleman whom, from long acquaintance, he regards with the highest esteem and respect, and reveres as one of the chief leaders of the most healthful and happy movement in the cause of true religion since the Reformation.' Newman must have winced at this implied comparison between himself and the Reformers. From the editor Mr. Ward turned to the writer of the article, and had a good deal to say about him. But the subject may be left here. The fact that the publication of the Statutes of a College engendered so much heat is interesting; but the rights and wrongs of the controversy are not; and, moreover, they could only be dealt with by an expert.

J. H. NEWMAN TO S. F. WOOD, Esq.

Littlemore: March 10, 1840.

My dear Wood,—It is an age since I have seen your handwriting; and, since I have questions to ask, I hope to elicit it.

Bloxam has long wished me to interfere in the school here—and since he is now summoned away by his Father's illness (by the bye he is leaving Littlemore to my great sorrow and regret) I have come up to try to mend matters.

I think you can get me some practical information and suggestions too.

What is thought of the system of monitors? What is thought of masters taking private or independent pupils?

I want to be put in the way generally—what the daily lessons should be, etc.

We have about 30 boys and girls, *each*. Have you not some outline engravings which you could recommend; or if not on the Society's list, yet which I could get. I want

a cheap Edition of Overbeck, etc. Can you give me any hint about music and psalmody? Any hint of whatever kind will be valuable, though I fear I can do little substantial while my present mistress continues, who was taken as being wife of the master and is a very incompetent person.

I have no news to tell you about Oxford—Right views and practices are spreading strangely; nor do I think with you that they tend to nothing more than rubricism. Yet I am not the less anxious on that account. Anglicanism has never yet been put to the test whether it will bear life; it may break to pieces in the rush and transport of existence, and die of joy.

You had better direct to me at Oxford, if you have anything to say. Tell me some London news.

Ever yrs. affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

The following is the rough draft of a letter to some one who seems to have taken exception to the following passage in the sermon on 'Secret Faults,' presumably on account of its affinity to the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory. 'Nay even to the true servants of Christ, the prospect<sup>1</sup> is awful. "The righteous," we are told, "will scarcely be saved." Then will the good man undergo the full sight of his sins, which on earth he was labouring to obtain, and partly succeeded in obtaining, though life was not long enough to learn and subdue them all. Doubtless we must all endure that fierce and terrifying vision of our real selves, that last fiery trial of the soul<sup>2</sup> before its acceptance, a spiritual agony and second death to all who are not then supported by the strength of Him who died to bring them safe through it, and in Whom on earth they have believed.'<sup>3</sup>

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO A CORRESPONDENT

Littlemore: April 15, 1840.

Dear Sir,—Thank you for your kind and frank note. I have referred to the passage of my sermon (on 'Secret Faults') and send you the following explanation of it.

<sup>1</sup> I.e. of the Last Day.

<sup>2</sup> 1 Cor. iii. 13.

<sup>3</sup> *Parochial Sermons*, i. 48.

I consider Scripture expressly tells us that the secrets of all hearts will be openly disclosed at the last day, 1 Cor. iv. 5 (*vide* also 1 Cor. iii. 13). But, if disclosed, to whom if not to the individual himself? and again, if thus disclosed to him it will be a most fearful and trying disclosure.

This is indeed a deduction of my own, but I signify it to be such by the word 'doubtless.'

I conceive everyone has a right to make his own inferences from Scripture, provided they are not such as to contradict what is directly revealed doctrine.

As to the particular deduction made in the passage in question, I have said the view of ourselves at the last day will be terrifying, but as to those who on earth have duly believed in our Lord, it will be without harm, as they will be supported by His strength; however that to others it will be a second death. I have considered that the mention of fire in 1 Cor. iii. 13 shadows this out among other things. Has that text no meaning?

My sermon was written in 1825, fifteen years hence. I hold to its awful view still, and wish it was more impressed upon my heart.

J. N.

The reader will find himself constantly reminded of the closing words of this letter. The fear of judicial blindness, the punishment of some 'Secret Faults' seems to have been constantly present to Newman's mind during the last two years or so of his Anglican life, and held him back. See especially the letters to Keble in 1843.

The following is the rough copy of a letter to some correspondent who found things that shocked him in Newman's recently published 'Church of the Fathers.'

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO A CORRESPONDENT

Oriel College: May 21, 1840.

My dear Sir,—I should gladly have replied to your kind note before this, had I more command of my time. It gave me much pleasure to find that the 'Church of the Fathers' was not unacceptable to you—that there are

things in it which you or others may wish away I can easily believe and should be very inconsiderate not to anticipate. Indeed I have frequent evidence of it from the candid statements of friends such as your own. What I find, however, is that persons whom I respect or value, while they all perhaps object, do not agree, or rather conflict with one another in their objections, and, though this does not show, nor do I take it to show, that I am therefore undeserving of criticism, yet it does make it hopeless to attempt to alter what I have written with a view of *pleasing* others, and seems to leave me at liberty to go by what I think truth in opinion and historical fact.

I am led to say this from your observing that 'I do not know how many really thoughtful men' I 'offend and alienate by some of my statements.' Certainly I do not know their numbers, but on the other hand I know perfectly, (if one must appeal to results), that I gain ardent and superior minds by the very things by which persons to whom you allude might be offended. Men are so variously constituted that we cannot appeal to expediency in this matter. I utterly despair of pleasing all persons, and find that, as I conciliate one, I offend another. I find this daily—I find I have to unlearn the habit, natural (I suppose) to most of us, of trying to please people. I have no misgiving in declaring what many probably will not believe of me, that I do not love paradox or wish to startle people. I am more and more convinced that the business of all of us is to be honest, and to court no one—and to leave the course of things to itself, or rather to higher guidance.

Another thing which somewhat hardens me against such friendly remonstrances as yours, is this—that from the time when my friends and I began to write on the subjects to which the 'Church of the Fathers' relates, we have been exclaimed against, reprobated, and *followed*. If you had our experience of the indignation and horror which has been the process through which men have been persuaded and converted, how they protested against points which can now be quietly assumed as first principles, how



we were accused of intemperance and rancour for writings which are now blamed as plausible, artful, and affectedly dispassionate, you would not wonder that I cannot help anticipating that some persons who just now are startled at the ' Church of the Fathers ' may end in allowing its statements, if not in approving them. The newest Tract or volume has always been *the* indiscreet one, and our last point but one has been that at which we ought to have stopped.

As to St. Gregory's address to St. Basil, and my remarks upon it, I assure you there are persons who have been much taken with those pages of my book, who see in them no ' sneer ' at our Church, who feel in them nothing repugnant to their Anglo-catholic principles. Indeed, I should have thought that what is there said was in accordance with your own views, viz. that Invocation of Saints, though not abstractedly wrong, has been proved by experience to be dangerous. At the same time surely it is a great principle of our Church, as expressed in the Canons of 1603, that ' usum non tollit abusus ' ; whereas to urge the abuse against the use is the very ground of the Puritans, which Hooker is at such pains to invalidate. Scripture is as silent about kneeling at the reception of the Elements or crossing in Baptism, as about making mention of the saints, after St. Gregory's manner ; on the other hand in our daily service we say, ' O ye spirits and souls of the righteous, O Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, bless ye the Lord,' which would seem to show that there are invocations which are not Romish.

As for celibacy does not the notion that it is not a holier state than matrimony tend to Pelagianism? Does not the conclusion that it is, follow from the words of the Article, ' Concupiscence has the nature of sin ' ? and what is the meaning of ' In sin hath my mother conceived me ' ?

I am, etc.,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

The ' address to St. Basil ' (three years after his death) ran as follows : ' This, O Basil, to thee from me. . . .

But O, that thou, divine and sacred heart, mayest watch over me from above, and that thorn of my flesh, which God has given me for my discipline, either end it by thy intercessions, or persuade me to bear it bravely! and mayest thou direct my whole life towards that which is most convenient! and when I depart hence mayest thou receive me into thy tabernacles!'<sup>1</sup>

The comment on this 'address' in which Newman's correspondent fancied he saw a sneer at the Church of England is omitted in later editions of the 'Church of the Fathers'; it was as follows:

'The English Church has removed such addresses from her Services, on account of the abuses to which they have led; and she pointedly condemns what she calls the Romish doctrine concerning Invocation of the Saints as "a fond thing"; however, Gregory not knowing what would come after his day, thus expresses the yearnings of his heart, and as we may suppose, at the time he thus made them public had already received an answer to them.'

Newman, so long as he was an Anglican, set his face against direct invocations of the saints. It was, in his eyes, a practice not to be adopted, even in private devotion, without the sanction of Authority.

### J. H. NEWMAN TO J. W. BOWDEN, Esq.

Oriel College: June 28, 1840.

My dearest Bowden,—I am truly glad to hear from Manuel [Johnston] of your arrival. In anticipation of your arrival I have arranged to come to town next week (about July 6) and must pass a day or some hours with you. I shall be partly at Westmacott's, partly at R. Williams's. On Tuesday next I go to Derby; if you write me a line direct, 'J. Mozley, Esq., Friar Gate, Derby.'—J. M. and my sister H. are there at present.

So you are back—God be praised. Rogers is going this winter. He is not so well quite as one should like.

I have various things to tell you, which I shall reserve till we meet. C. Marriott, who is writing opposite to me, desires kindest remembrances.

<sup>1</sup> 'Church of the Fathers,' *Hist. Sketches*, ii. 75.

I will give you some account of some of your Tracts.

	1 Edn.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
No. 5.	1000	1000	1000	750	1000	1500	1500
No. 29.	1000	500	750	1000	1000	1500	1500
No. 30.	1000	750	1000	1000	1500	1500	

I have made a table of *all* of them and their editions. The Tracts have *cleared* £300 this last year.

Kindest thoughts of your wife and children, all blessings be with you.

Ever yrs. affly,

J. H. NEWMAN.

In June, 1839, Newman wrote to Bowden: 'We sold altogether about 60,000 Tracts last year.'

J. H. NEWMAN TO S. F. WOOD, Esq.

Oriel: September 6, 1840.

My dear Wood,—Your sketch was very satisfactory. Pusey much approved it. He has marked two passages, I think, for correction—which perhaps you had better look to yourself. I hardly agree with him. In one you speak of Froude's views as influencing the writers of the Tracts. Now Pusey of course ought to be excluded—but as to the *anonymous* writers it is quite true—and I could not consent to it not being said. The other is where you prophecy that the English Clergy will fall back again upon the Rubrics—I should think it a great pity to omit that passage. But, since Pusey perhaps thinks it is not sanguine enough, perhaps you could put in a sentence or a clause, saying 'we hope otherwise, etc., etc.'

I want you to review Hope's speech<sup>1</sup> in the House of Lords for the *British Critic* and give a sketch of the *history of the struggle*. Some record should be made of it, and it will soon be forgotten if not done at once. You are one of the few persons who can do it.

My love to R.W. and thank him for his kind and

<sup>1</sup> On Anglican Chapters. See Hope-Scott's *Life*.

comfortable letter, which I hope he did not expect me to acknowledge.

Pusey is returned better and more cheerful than I have seen him many a day.

I have been sadly pressed with the *B.C.* this quarter. At one time I almost thought I should have to write  $\frac{3}{4}$  of it myself—but the prospect brightens—and T.M.<sup>1</sup> I hope will come to the rescue. The said T.M. has 20,000 bricks in his Church yard, and his people are dispersed over the plain gathering flints; he being in the act of rebuilding his Church.

I am glad to hear so good an account of yourself. As to Shuttleworth,<sup>2</sup> I suppose we shall have some episcopal Charges from him aimed at certain things.

Ever yrs. affectionately,  
JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—I will send you MS. when and whither you direct.

The following letter introduces us to one of the most valued of Newman's friends and advisers for over a quarter of a century. Edward Lowth Badeley, Q.C., was educated at Brasenose College, Oxford, taking his degree in 1823. In 1841 he was called to the Bar. As a lawyer he devoted himself almost wholly to ecclesiastical cases. He was one of the counsel employed by the Bishop of Exeter in the Gorham case. In 1852 he became a Catholic. He lived almost the life of a recluse in his chambers, devoting himself from 'that time exclusively to the solution of the various legal difficulties attending the administration of Roman Catholic trusts and charities.'<sup>3</sup> He was the friend—'a man about my own age, who lives out of the world of theological controversy and contemporary literature, and whose intellectual habits especially qualify him for taking a clear and impartial view of the force of words,'—consulted by Newman about the adequacy of Kingsley's apology for the insulting remarks in *Macmillan's Magazine*. If he had ruled Kingsley's *amende* satisfactory, the 'Apologia' in all probability would never have been written. Newman dedicated his 'Verses on

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Mozley.

<sup>2</sup> Bishop of Chichester.

<sup>3</sup> *Gentleman's Magazine*, v. 618 (1868).

Various Occasions, to Badeley, wishing it to be 'the poor expression, long-delayed, of my gratitude, never to be intermitted, for the great services which you rendered me years ago, by your legal skill and affectionate zeal, in a serious matter, in which I found myself in collision with the law of the land.'

J. H. NEWMAN TO E. L. BADELEY, Esq.

Oriel: September 16, 1840.

My dear Badeley,—I fear you have thought me neglectful of your kind note. Till I saw Hope I was not quite certain whether 'Temple' would have been enough of a direction—he has given me more.

It pleased me not a little to read what you said of that Sermon—which relates to a very large subject, of which it is but a part. I have been trying from time to time to work it out but not to my satisfaction. Should I ever do so, the Sermon might appear as part of a whole. The volume I am going to publish is to be on a particular line of subjects, with which it would not fall in.

Do not think I do not value your suggestion or advice, and shall not be grateful for it at any time, because I do not avail myself of it now.

A pleasant tour to you—*pray* try to make Hope understand he *must* take care of his health in Italy, and that if he rambles about he had better stay at home.

Yours very sincerely,  
JOHN H. NEWMAN.

The volume of sermons about to be published must have been 'Parochial Sermons,' vol. v., the preface to which is dated October 21, 1840. The particular sermon to which the letter refers must have been 'Implicit and Explicit Reason,'<sup>1</sup> which was preached 'on St. Peter's Day, 1840.'

<sup>1</sup> *University Sermons*, No. XIII.

## CHAPTER III

### TRACT XC. JANUARY TO APRIL 1841

Quae ignorabam interrogabant me

THE year 1841 was as eventful as the preceding one had been uneventful ; for it was the year of Tract 90, and the ill-starred Anglo-Prussian Jerusalem Bishopric.

The editors have not in their hands many important letters written by Newman in connection with Tract 90 which have not already been published either by Miss Mozley or in the 'Life of Dr. Pusey,' but there are many of considerable interest which he received ; and from these, chiefly, a selection has been made.<sup>1</sup>

Tract 90 was published on February 27, 1841. Like its predecessors, with one or two exceptions, it was anonymous. But the veil of anonymity was so thin that everyone in Oxford must have seen through it. On March 8, four senior Tutors addressed to the Editor of Tracts for the Times, 'i.e. Newman, a not very happily worded letter—there was a tone of self-conscious correctness and moderation about it—in which they expressed their *apprehension* that the Tract had a *highly dangerous tendency* and their feeling that some one should avow himself responsible for it. In giving specimens of the grounds of their *apprehension* they betrayed such an entire misunderstanding of the scope of the Tract, that it might almost seem pardonable to suspect that every one of the four, feeling confident that the other three had studied it, omitted to do so himself. It is, of course, certain that none of them was competent

<sup>1</sup> All the official documents connected with Tract 90, viz. the Tract itself ; the Letter of the Four Tutors ; the Censure of the Tract ; Newman's Letter to the Vice-Chancellor after the appearance of the censure ; the Letter to Dr. Jelf ; the Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, are reprinted in *Via Media*, vol. ii.

to pronounce an opinion. A novel and complicated piece of critical research, such as was Tract 90, cannot be mastered by the most practised intellect in the space of eight days.

Copies of the letter were at once put in circulation. It was obviously the opening of a campaign. Two days later, on March 10, the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Wynter, brought the Tract and the Letter of the Tutors before the Hebdomadal Board. On March 12 Newman, with the rapidity that he was capable of in an emergency, vindicated the Tract from the misinterpretations of the Tutors, and cut away the ground of the impending censure, in his Letter to Dr. Jelf. This was submitted to Dr. Jelf, and sent to the press the following day. On March 15 the Hebdomadal Board, refusing to wait for the publication of the Letter to Dr. Jelf, condemned the Tract. On March 16 Newman entered in his diary, 'Hebdomadal Act came out early in the morning. My letter to Dr. Jelf came out at midday. Dined in Hall.' On the same day he publicly acknowledged himself the author of the Tract in a courteous letter to the Vice-Chancellor.

If the Hebdomadal Board, instead of being in such a hurry to strike, had condescended to wait a few hours for the promised vindication of the Tract, they might have been saved from doing a very foolish thing. There were two important facts which they could have learned from the Letter to Dr. Jelf. The first was that the writer of the Tract had a good deal to say in his defence; the second, that he was not a wanton disturber of the peace, merely unsettling people's minds. The members of the Board acted under the impression that the Tract was designed to foster *Romanising* tendencies. It never occurred to them to ask whether these tendencies had not passed the stage in which they needed fostering, and whether a toleration of the views put forward in Tract 90 might not be the best means of restraining them. 'No one,' lamented Dr. Pusey, nearly a quarter of a century later, 'can tell how much the subsequent history of the Church of England might not have been altered, had the respite of the few hours [needed for the publication of the Letter to Dr. Jelf] been granted.'<sup>1</sup> Equally severe, though not a lament, was the judgment

<sup>1</sup> *Tract XC* . . . with Historical Preface by the Rev. E. B. Pusey, &c. First published in 1866. The above is quoted from p. xiii of the edition of 1903.

passed by Frederick Oakeley on the blindness of the Hebdomadal Board :

‘ Had the Oxford authorities been far-sighted enough to take Dr. Newman for their guide, and allowed Tract 90 to do its intended work without molestation, I do not say they would have prevented the subsequent conversions to the Church, but they might have indefinitely retarded them. Thank God who ordered it otherwise.’ Newman realised what the authorities were too heedless to know, ‘ the depth in the yearning [in the minds of many] after Rome : and . . . that the best way to encourage this yearning was to close up, without necessity, the interpretation of the Articles.’<sup>1</sup>

The thesis put forward in Tract 90 may be summed up in a dictum, current at the time, to the effect that the Articles *were patient but not ambitious of a Catholic interpretation*. The writer of the Tract insisted, with a distinctness which severely taxed the forbearance of many of his friends and supporters, that the *animus* of the Articles was uncatholic, that they were the product of an uncatholic age, that they were not intended to inculcate Catholic doctrine ; but having admitted all this, he maintained that they were of deliberate purpose so framed that it might be possible for men having Catholic leanings to subscribe to them without doing violence either to their own consciences, or to ‘ the literal and grammatical sense ’ of the Articles.

To quote his own words : ‘ Their framers constructed them in such a way as best to comprehend those who did not go so far in Protestantism as themselves. Anglo-Catholics are but the successors and representatives of those moderate reformers ; and their case has been directly anticipated in the wording of the Articles. It follows that they are not perverting, they are using them for an express purpose for which among others their authors framed them.’ He then proceeds to illustrate this by the history of the 28th Article. ‘ In the beginning of Elizabeth’s reign a paragraph formed part of this Article . . . in which the Real Presence was *denied in words* . . . Burnet observes on it thus :

“ When these Articles were first prepared by the con-

<sup>1</sup> *Popular Lectures*. ‘ Personal Reminiscences of the Oxford Movement,’ Lect. II, p. 9 [1855].



vocation in Queen Elizabeth's reign, this paragraph was made part of them. . . . But the *design of the government* [the italics are Newman's] was at that time much turned to the *drawing over the body of the nation to the Reformation*, in whom the old leaven had gone deep; and in no part of it deeper than the belief of the corporeal presence of Christ in the sacrament; therefore it was *thought not expedient to offend* them by so particular a definition in this matter; in which the very word Real Presence was rejected."

The concluding words of the Tract were: 'The Protestant confession was drawn up with the purpose of including Catholics; and Catholics now will not be excluded. What was an economy in the Reformers is a protection to us. What would have been a perplexity to us then, is a perplexity to Protestants now. We could not then have found fault with their words; they cannot now repudiate our meaning.'

It seems perfectly clear that if the history of the Articles was as Newman describes it, his method of interpreting them was unassailable. But, as will presently be shown, the history of the Articles was far from being his only argument.

One may here call the reader's attention to the distinction drawn in the Tract between *Romish*, a term used in the Thirty-nine Articles, and *Tridentine*. It was this apparently paradoxical distinction which lay at the root of the four Tutors' misconstruction of the Tract. It also brought Dr. Wiseman into the fray, and led Dr. Russell of Maynooth to enter into correspondence with Newman.

By *Tridentine* was meant the cut-and-dried propositions enunciated in the decrees of Trent. These decrees were promulgated *after* the Thirty-nine Articles were drawn up.

By *Romish*, the term used in the Articles, was meant something far vaguer and more indeterminate,<sup>1</sup> viz. what was taught in the theological schools and from the pulpit, and embodied in numberless devotional usages and practices. This was vividly present to the framers of the Articles. It was part and parcel of the living system in which they had been nurtured, and into which they dug their knives.

It was not, of course, suggested that *Romish* doctrine

<sup>1</sup> And (though this point is not handled in the Tract) far more exposed to misrepresentation and caricature at the hands of the Reformers.

contradicted Tridentine doctrine or even that it was dis-  
countenanced by it. Just the opposite was insisted upon.  
But it was maintained that the former outstripped the  
latter, much as popular Protestantism went beyond the  
Thirty-nine Articles. Both England and Rome had their  
traditionary system which was not fully represented by  
their formularies.

The distinction was both legitimate and to the purpose.  
It was legitimate because a less developed system of devo-  
tion, and in a measure even of belief regarding some matters,  
than that which prevailed, might be theoretically com-  
patible with the bare letter of the decrees of Trent. It  
was to the purpose because it is the first duty of a com-  
mentator to ascertain the exact meaning of the terms used  
in his text.

This distinction between *Romish* and Tridentine had often  
been made by Newman before ; it was not therefore devised  
for the benefit of the thesis which he put forward in Tract  
90.<sup>1</sup> But it had an important bearing upon it. There  
were matters upon which the decrees of Trent spoke in such  
general terms, that to take them as representing the  
doctrines which the Articles condemned, would come  
dangerously near to bringing the Articles in collision with  
doctrines and practices which all students of antiquity had  
to allow were primitive.

But there were further reasons for making much of this  
distinction. It seemed to be necessary in order to preserve  
the very idea of a Catholic Church for English Churchmen.  
According to the Tractarian theory England, Rome and the  
East were branches of the one indivisible Catholic Church.  
The difficulty, a fearfully anxious one to those for whose  
sake Tract 90 had been written, was to reconcile this theory  
with the first note of the Church, that of unity. The only  
means of coming to terms with this difficulty was to mini-  
mise the differences between England and Rome by  
endeavouring to show that they were not radical ones. To  
unchurch Rome by accusing her of having formally and  
officially contravened the Faith at a General Council was

<sup>1</sup> The legitimacy of the distinction from an Anglican point of view  
might have occurred to the censors of Tract 90 if they had given them-  
selves as many months as they took days before pronouncing judgment  
upon it. *Explanations*, not *retractations*, of canonised formularies were at  
the basis of such projects of Reunion as had been from time to time enter-  
tained by English Churchmen of unimpeachable soundness.

like a *reductio ad absurdum*; for who could look facts steadily in the face and believe in a 'Holy Church throughout the world' from which all the Churches in communion with the See of Peter were excluded?

After all, then, it was not such a paradoxical thing for a clergyman of the Church of England to explore what might be done in the way of a benignant interpretation of the decrees of Trent, and the more learned of his brethren ought to have thought twice before raising a popular outcry against him. He was only vindicating their right to profess belief in one of the articles of the creed.

The critical principles of Tract 90 may be summarised thus. The Articles are to be studied in the light of the following facts:

1. They do not profess to be a complete body of divinity. Doctrines therefore which they do not mention are not of necessity condemned.

2. The Convocation which received and passed them spoke with respect of 'the Catholic Fathers and Ancient Bishops.' They were not, therefore, intended to be inconsistent with patristic literature.

3. They approve of the *Homilies* as 'containing a godly and wholesome doctrine.' It was therefore reasonable to interpret them in the light of the said *Homilies*. Now, on the one hand, the *Homilies* countenance much Catholic doctrine which is not found in the Articles, and, on the other hand, when they seem most unsparing in their denunciation of Catholic ideas, they are often found, whether intentionally or unintentionally, to miss the real Catholic doctrine, and to hit at real or imaginary abuses of it.

4. The Articles were published before the decrees of the Council of Trent. The importance of this fact has already been pointed out.

5. Those who imposed the Articles on the clergy wished it to be possible for men of widely different views, not excluding those who did not wish to break altogether with the past, to be able to subscribe to them.

All these facts created a presumption that the Articles when examined critically would prove 'patient but not ambitious of a Catholic interpretation.' The object of Tract 90 was to test this presumption.

The Tract may be considered as having two objects

in view. The first, the most important, and the immediately practical one was to prove that the Thirty-nine Articles did not condemn the Anglican *Via Media* as it was expounded by the writers of the 'Tracts for the Times.'

The secondary and altogether subordinate object might be described as a tentative inquiry into how far Rome, supposing her to be ready to treat with England on equal terms, would be able to offer interpretations of the decrees of Trent which Anglicans could accept. It was over this secondary object that the author of the Tract exposed himself to misconstruction and misrepresentation. People jumped to the conclusion that he was ready to surrender everything and ask nothing in return. The very opposite was the fact. Those who had most right to complain, if they had cared to do so, were the Catholics. They were asked to move out of range of the Articles by adopting almost admittedly forced interpretations of the decrees of Trent. The Tutors in their Letter enumerated five points upon which, as they alleged, the Tract made no difference between the doctrine of the Articles and the authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome. These five points were: (1) Purgatory; (2) Indulgences; (3) the Honours paid to Images and Relics; (4) the Invocation of the Saints; (5) the Mass. The list is a useful one. It contains practically all the points upon which, in Newman's eyes, the differences between the two Churches were almost irreconcilable ones. The concessions which, as an Anglican, he would have demanded from Rome upon these several points were little else than capitulation with the honours of war.

Newman always maintained that Tract 90 was a legitimate interpretation of the Articles. He did so in the 'Apologia,' and again in the second volume of his '*Via Media*.' But in 1883 he expressed himself dissatisfied with the reasoning in one important part of the Tract, viz. sec. 9, which treats of Art. xxxi., 'the sacrifice of masses,' &c.<sup>1</sup>

There was an important group of Churchmen who were in substantial agreement with the Tractarians, but disliked and distrusted their methods and the length to which they carried their principles. To this school Tract 90 must have been a sore trial. Nevertheless, when trouble began, its leaders stood by Newman. The first to come forward was Palmer of Worcester. His conduct was particularly hand-

<sup>1</sup> See later editions of *Via Media*, vol. ii. pp. 251-256.

some, because for some time past there had been a coolness between him and Newman.<sup>1</sup> He wrote the following letter the day before the Tract was brought under the notice of the Hebdomadal Board.

REV. W. PALMER TO J. H. NEWMAN

St. Giles : [March 9, 1841].

My dear Newman,—Though I have taken no part in the discussions relative to the Tracts, I yet feel it my duty to express to you, under present circumstances, the gratification which I have derived from No. 90 just published. While I should hesitate to commit myself to every statement contained in it, I have no hesitation in expressing an opinion that it is the *most valuable* of the series of Tracts that has come under my observation. It will tend to shake people out of their implicit reception of *traditionary interpretations* which impose human opinions as little less than articles of faith. It will lead to a really *critical* system of interpreting the Articles, and will ultimately produce more union on the articles of *Catholic Faith*, and more toleration of *opinions* which have been at all times tolerated in the Universal Church.

I may perhaps have seen a few expressions that I could have wished otherwise, but on the whole I most cordially thank you for this interesting Tract, and if my opinion can be of any service to you I do not wish to conceal it.

Ever Yours,

W. PALMER.

If Mr. Palmer's letter had been written a few days earlier, and circulated before people had had time to commit themselves, it might have saved the situation ; for he was one of the most learned theologians of the day, and the soundness of his Churchmanship was beyond suspicion. Newman, who was at Littlemore, sent it at once to Church. Church passed it on to W. G. Ward, who showed it among other persons to Tait, and then scrawled a hasty note to

<sup>1</sup> *Letters of the Rev. J. B. Mozley*, p. 113.

Church reporting that Tait was 'extremely struck' by it, and asking that it might be placed in the hands of Dr. Richards, the Rector of Exeter, for 'Tait says Twiss tells him there is a report of the Heads meeting to-day on the subject.' Church forwarded Ward's letter to Newman, writing at the bottom of it :

'Dear N.,—I have said *yes*. I suppose I have done right.—Yours affectly, R. W. C.' Later on, the same day, he wrote as follows :

REV. R. W. CHURCH TO J. H. NEWMAN

March 10 [1841].

My dear Newman,—The Heads had a meeting to-day, sure enough to discuss No. 90, and Cornish<sup>1</sup> came to me after it was over, and reported what the Rector<sup>2</sup> had said of it. It seems that nothing was done to-day for two reasons: 1, That they had a good deal of other business, and 2, that many or most of the assembly had not yet read the said Tract. However they were very fierce against it, and against the Tracts in general, against which they seem to have declared 'War to the knife.' They are accordingly to meet again on Friday at 2 to determine on their measures, as by that time everybody may be presumed 'up' in the Tract.

The feeling in the board is represented by the Rector<sup>2</sup> as so strong that he did not like to read P's letter, as it would have been throwing 'cold water on red-hot iron.' Cornish seemed to think that he would not read it, but he is to take it with him on Friday, to make what use he may of it according to circumstances. He has not read the Tract himself yet, but there is no doubt but that though he might differ, and perhaps strongly with part of it, he would be utterly opposed to any step against it. Daman<sup>3</sup> seems to be of the same mind; I showed him Palmer's letter this morning—which has reassured and comforted

<sup>1</sup> Rev. C. L. Cornish, Fellow of Exeter.

<sup>2</sup> Dr. Richards, Rector of Exeter.

<sup>3</sup> Rev. C. Daman, Fellow of Oriel.

Cornish himself, as far as he wanted comfort. Keble is here in my room writing his lecture. All well. He hangs out in Rogers' room.

Ever yours affectionately,

R. W. C.

Golias [Golightly] is in high glee; he ventured to join the *πομπή* of the Provost, and actually took the condescending line about a paper which he had sent the Provost<sup>1</sup> and which the latter had not yet looked at.

REV. R. W. CHURCH TO J. H. NEWMAN

Oriel: March 11, 1841.

My dear Newman,—I have shown your note to Cornish, I. Williams and Keble. They all agree that it is better to remain quiet and not give up your name till it is officially called for. The Exeter C.R. [Common Room] according to Cornish (i.e. Sewell, Dayman and Spranger) are all of this mind. Things might be said *out of* Oxford against an anonymous Tract, which would not be said against you and I should have thought it desirable that your name should come out ultimately; but this it will in the course of things, I suppose, time enough to meet *τὰ ἔξω*, while *in Oxford* to give it *now*, would be merely giving them a move.

People are still very angry. Golly<sup>2</sup> has struck up a great intimacy with the Provost, whom he has propemped<sup>3</sup> twice to his lodgings, and whom he patronises most kindly. The first consequence to the Provost of his new alliance was the loss of his breakfast this morning owing to G.'s pertinacious prosing. There was a meeting from 9 to 11—but I don't know what about. The report is that V.C. has said he will not meddle: other people talk of an admonition to the Four<sup>4</sup>—concerning *what*? Keble has written to V.C. saying that he had carefully read the Tract and

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Hawkins, Provost of Oriel.

<sup>2</sup> Golightly.

<sup>3</sup> A word coined by the writer from *προπέμπω*.

<sup>4</sup> The Four Tutors.

recommended its publication. He does not think that anything will come of it.

The *Times* is flinching, but at the same time kicks the Four [Tutors]. I have shown P's letter to Mules, Eden, and Daman. I. Williams showed it to Short: I suppose I have not been too free with it. I let Mules take a copy.

I am sorry to say that S. Wilberforce has just lost his wife. She died yesterday.

Ever Yours affectionately,

R. W. C.

A copy of the following letter was sent by Church to Newman. It is undated, but must have been written before news had reached the writer of the censure of the Hebdomadal Board, and the Letter to Dr. Jelf.

REV. G. MOBERLY TO REV. R. W. CHURCH

Dear Richard,—I am much obliged to you for Palmer's letter. I have now read No. 90 carefully, and though I find both some expressions and some opinions indicated which I am not prepared to go with, yet on the whole the Tract in its main design, and 19/20ths of its execution appear to me *most valuable*. We want to be taught that we have a higher and holier origin than the Reformation and the Articles: and that it is a matter of separate thankfulness that we can hold the Church's Truth, and at the same time sign the Terms of National Communion. Meanwhile many really take the Articles for Creed, Scripture, Church, and Commandments. I am extremely anxious to hear further, and whensoever you *can* write shall rejoice to hear. But what practical measures can be taken? I shall probably see Keble to-morrow.

Your affectionately,

GEORGE MOBERLY.<sup>1</sup>

'There were indeed men, besides my own immediate friends, men of name and position, who gallantly took my

<sup>1</sup> Afterwards Bishop of Salisbury.



part, as Dr. Hook, Mr. Palmer, and Mr. Perceval.' [*Apologia*, p. 89.] The following letter was from the last named of these three :

REV. A. PERCEVAL TO J. H. NEWMAN

East Horsley : March 10, 1841.

My dear Newman,—Pusey, whom pray thank for his letter received to-day, writes me word of some counter movement in consequence of the last Tract. This has led me to look it over more carefully than I had done before, and it seems to me both right to you, and a satisfaction to myself to tell you, that though in my shortsightedness I could have wished it at another time than just at present when men are perhaps less qualified to receive the statements calmly, than they were a little time back, or will be probably a little time hence—I mean from the *political* espousal of the question pro and con. by the state politicians—and though I should have been tempted to employ a little more of the wisdom of the serpent, e.g. not have unnecessarily quoted the passage from Estius which both from the matter and author must needs be very likely to raise a cry of war to the knife. Yet I think it one of the most important papers that has been put out, and calculated, under God's Blessing to do much good. Its main object is unexceptionable, and in details its opponents must look sharp to ground a serious objection.

If I can be of any service I will not fail you. But that can only be if good opportunity offers, which does not depend upon myself.

Yours in heart and affection,  
ARTHUR PERCEVAL.<sup>1</sup>

On March 12 Pusey wrote to the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Wynter. His letter defended Tract 90 from the aspersions cast upon it by the Tutors, and called attention to its opportuneness.

<sup>1</sup> His [i.e. the author's] feelings were these : our Church has condemned nothing Catholic, but only Romish errors ;

<sup>1</sup> For Newman's reply see Notes, p. 393.

yet there are certain opinions and practices, more or less prevailing in Catholic antiquity, having some relation to the later Romish error, which might seem to be condemned by our Articles, as they are often popularly understood. This would be a subject of great perplexity to some minds . . . (I happen to know one such case, which would, as far as an individual can be, be a great blow and shock, where a person's doubts, whether he will remain in communion with our Church, turn on this very point.) Thus, as he has noticed, there are several opinions of there being some Purgatorial process before or at the Day of Judgment, whereby those who departed out of this life in an imperfect state would be fitted for the Presence of God. Are all these (such an one would ask) condemned by our Church ?'

The whole letter should be read;<sup>1</sup> but this extract from it will be enough to show how seriously the authorities were warned of the risk they ran by not keeping their hands off Tract 90.

The following undated letter of Pusey's must have been written on March 13 or 14; the 'paper' which is spoken of was the Letter to Dr. Jelf.

#### REV. E. B. PUSEY TO J. H. NEWMAN

My dear N.—I like the beginning of your paper *very* much; it is very clear. There is an admission in a page towards the end which I have turned down which would be laid hold of. Could you not qualify it consistently with your opinion? 'The only religious communion practically in possession of the something is the Church of Rome.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> It is given *in extenso* in Pusey's *Life*, ii. 170.

<sup>2</sup> The following is the passage alluded to. Perhaps in its present form it owes something to Pusey's suggestions: 'The age is moving towards something, and most unhappily the one religious communion among us which has of late years been in possession of this something, is the Church of Rome. She alone, amid all the errors and evils of her practical system, has given free scope to the feelings of awe, mystery, tenderness, reverence, devotedness, and other feelings which may be especially called Catholic. The question then is, whether we shall give them up to the Roman Church or claim them for ourselves, as we well may, by reverting to that older system, which has of late years indeed been superseded, but which has been and is, quite congenial . . . to our Church.' *Via Media*, ii. 386.

Could you not mark it as being a temporary deficiency in our system, not as if our Church never had had it (as in the 17th century), or as if it might not be brought out in our Church, if we acted up to her system; and again might something be thrown in as to the comparative purity of English Romanism, e.g. 'The only religious community which has of late years (or the like) been practically in possession of that something is the Church of Rome, which being seen among us chiefly as it acts upon the higher classes is, as Bishop Lloyd observed, free from' etc.? But this is long.

I see your next sentence does qualify this; only this is pithy and might be extracted if not guarded.

The further points which I want to see brought out are (1) that the latitude of interpretation which you claim would not extend in other hands to the first five Articles,<sup>1</sup> because, as you say in the one class the writers meant to be comprehensive, in the other definite. (2) Could you explain prudently how far you would wish this explanation of the Articles to go? What are the Catholic or quasi-Catholic tenets or practices which you would wish for the sake of others to see admitted by this construction of the Articles?

(3) To show again how the Articles bear this, that e.g. if they speak of the *Romish* doctrine of Purgatory they do not mean the Greek Purgatorial fire at the Day of Judgment: if they say the *Romish* invocation of Saints they do not mean such apostrophies as you find in St. Gregory Nazianzen etc.

Could you explain the term 'stammering formularies' as I understand they are (as in Isaiah<sup>2</sup>) providentially fitted to our imperfect state (as in Williams' Tract)?<sup>3</sup> If persons so ill bear our Baptismal service, how much less would they bear a Communion Service in which the true doctrine was developed?

I understand people have been most perplexed by the view of the last pages, as if the writers of the Articles were

<sup>1</sup> Those dealing with the Mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation.

<sup>2</sup> Isaiah xxviii. II.

<sup>3</sup> The reference is to Tract 86, and to the arguments on pp. 80-82. This was kindly pointed out by Canon Johnston.

taken in their own trap, and by this expression [i.e. stammering formularies].

I enclose a painful note from the Vice Chancellor, but it may show you where the difficulty lies.

I see you mean to preserve your anonymousness which I believe would be very desirable till the Heads of Houses have decided.

Yours very affectly,  
E. B. P.

I mentioned to Jelf your thought of writing to him, which he quite enters into, but thought it very desirable that you should keep your anonymousness.

I called just now, but it was only with a view of talking over and explaining what I have set down in this note.

Could you show by quotations what the authoritative teaching was before the Council of Trent, so as to contrast it with the earlier views of the Fathers, since the more definite that teaching and that system, the less room will there be for identifying it with the Fathers.

The following are the two passages which according to Dr. Pusey perplexed many people. The first comes quite at the beginning of the Tract.

'Till we feel this, till we seek one another as brethren, not lightly throwing aside our private opinions, which we seem to feel we have received from above, from an ill-regulated, untrue desire of unity, but returning to each other in heart, and coming together to God to do for us what we cannot do for ourselves, no change can be for the better. Till her members are stirred up to this religious course, let the Church sit still; let her be content to be in bondage; let her work in chains; let her submit to her imperfections as a punishment; let her go on teaching with the stammering lips of ambiguous formularies' &c.

The second passage is the conclusion of the Tract. It follows a long quotation from Burnet on the Articles already given;<sup>1</sup> it described how in Article XXVIII, because '*the design of the Government was at that time much turned to the drawing over the body of the nation to the Reformation,*' a para-

<sup>1</sup> P. 72.

graph rejecting the very term Real Presence was expunged, and there were substituted for it words which were ambiguous.

'What has lately taken place,' commented the author of the Tract, 'in the political world will afford an illustration in point. A French minister desirous of war, nevertheless, as a matter of policy draws up his state papers in such moderate language that his successor, who is for peace, can act up to them, without compromising his own principles. The world, observing this, has considered it a circumstance for congratulation; as if the former minister, who acted a double part, had been caught in his own snare. It is neither decorous, nor necessary, nor altogether fair, to urge the parallel rigidly; but it will explain what is here meant to convey. The Protestant Confession was drawn up with the purpose of including Catholics; and Catholics now will not be excluded. What was an economy in the Reformers, is a protection to us. What would have been a perplexity to us then, is a perplexity to Protestants now. We could not then have found fault with their words; they cannot now repudiate our meaning.'

Thirty-five years afterwards Newman appended the following note to the passage in Pusey's letter about 'the writers of the Articles being caught in their own trap':

N.B. : Aug. 9, 1876.

I *did* mean this. It was always a wonder to me that Pusey and Manning wished me to cut out my concluding words of No. 90, which were necessary for my position; I always said 'The Article framers were double-tongued or I. I said in these last words that it was the *Article framers*.'

On March 14 Oakeley, who was carrying out Tractarian principles at the Margaret Street Chapel in London, wrote a long letter to Pusey to the following effect. All persons whom he met, and he was not speaking of those who would be called 'extreme people,' felt themselves indebted to the author of Tract 90; and till the news came of the Tutors' protest, he had heard of no objections except from some correspondent in the *Times*. There were persons about him, among the most valuable members of the Church, who had long felt perplexity about certain passages in the Articles; and could not, except on the supposition of a 'Catholic inter-

pretation' being possible, subscribe to them &c. This letter must have been a great comfort to Newman. It was proof not only that the Tract was needed, but also that it was doing its work.

A country clergyman wrote, March 16, 1841 :

TO J. H. NEWMAN

' I have just heard of the uproar and got No. 90 of the Tracts, as I was in town to-day. All I can say is that should any vote of censure on the part of Convocation be proposed, I shall feel quite happy to come up to oppose such a thing. . . . Of course I cannot pretend to enter into the full bearings of every point—that would be presumptuous, but allow me to say that I owe much, very much to your example, and, with your leave, friendship to me. I met by chance in Rivington's shop Golightly . . . his temper of mind was to me very sad, and I could not help telling him in plain terms what I thought of him. I was with the Bishop of London—he was especially kind . . . I live out of the world, but still am anxious to do my duty. If therefore I am wanted let me know.

Very truly and gratefully yours.'

Newman concluded his Letter to Dr. Jelf as follows :

' In conclusion I will but express my great sorrow that I have at all startled or offended those for whom I have nothing but respectful and kind feelings. That I am startled myself in turn, that persons who have in years past and present borne patiently disclaimers of the Athanasian Creed, or of the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, or of belief in many of the Scripture miracles, should now be alarmed so much, when a private Member of the University without his name, makes statements in an opposite direction, I must also avow.'

The same idea struck his brother-in-law Thomas Mozley, who on March 17 wrote :

REV. T. MOZLEY TO J. H. NEWMAN

March 17, 1841.

You will have as little time to read as I have to write just now. Your packet has just come, and I cannot let the post go, without saying that we both feel the fullest and calmest confidence in your cause and you. For my own part I am rejoiced to see the controversy becoming one of acts.

I have read the first sheet of your Letter, and Harriet the second. I was just observing on the Heads of Houses having required a 1000 men to be pushing them a whole month before they would repudiate a denial of the doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation, and now 4 men, and these of no such very great weight, are able in 4 days to make them speak on a question which leaves these doctrines alone, and merely affects the distinctive grounds of the Establishment—I was just saying this when Harriet showed me a passage in the second sheet at the conclusion to the purpose.

I must confess that I have not yet seen the Tract, but am expecting it every day. You have my prayers which I wish I could suppose were as effectual and fervent as the cause deserves. Lord Morpeth and Macdonald will, of course, have the credit of this movement. By the bye there must be a traitor in Oxford somewhere, for the article in the *Dublin Review* on Sewell's article on Romanism, written I suppose by Quin, shows the most perfect acquaintance with Sewell's character and circumstances.

On March 17 Dr. Hook, the first of those whom Newman singles out in the 'Apologia' as 'gallantly' taking his part, wrote:

REV. W. F. HOOK TO J. H. NEWMAN

Vicarage, Leeds: March 17, 1841.

Dear Newman,—I write a line merely to express to you my most cordial sympathy and my readiness to stand by my friends at Oxford in any steps they may agree to take at this painful Crisis. Our enemies force us into the position of a Party, and as a Party we must be prepared to act;

by which I mean, that in any ulterior proceedings little minor points of difference must be forgotten, and we must act as one man in asserting our general Principles.

Do the Heads of the Houses form the University of Oxford? If so we must submit. If not, does not their conduct render it necessary for us to ascertain what the opinion of the University is? It seems to me that we shall be compelled to have the formal decision of the University now. May we be guided by a Wisdom not our own!

You will, I am sure, pardon me for saying that if these were piping Times of peace I should have a little quarrel with you for some things in Tract 90. I do not like your *seeming* to assert that High Churchmen generally have found a difficulty in holding Catholic Principles consistently with a subscription to the Articles. I do not like your assuming that our Reformers were uncatholic when Manning and other High Churchmen contend for the contrary: your opinion is different, but the question is not decided among us; and I do not like your insinuating that while repudiating the Romish Doctrine with reference to Images, Relics, etc. we wish to maintain *some* doctrine on these points on which I presume no Catholic Doctrine exists. I mention these points that if you write on this painful occasion you may say something on them for the satisfaction of your friends. At the same time we must ever thank you for boldly vindicating in this Tract our Liberty of interpreting the Articles in our own and not in a traditional sense.

I have only to repeat to you the cordial expression of my sympathy and of my readiness to stand by you.

Your very affectionate Friend,

W. F. Hook.

Newman did not get Hook's letter till the 19th, for on the 18th he 'went over to Littlemore and slept there.' He had plenty to think of, for the morning's post had brought two letters from his Bishop, one to Pusey, and another, enclosed in the letter to Pusey, to himself. Both letters were as kind and considerate as they could be, but there was no mistaking the fact that the writer was anxious and dis-



tressed. In the letter to Newman he merely expressed his earnest wish that there should be no more discussions upon the Articles in the Tracts; to Pusey he suggested that Newman might perhaps be willing to publish explanations avowing that he did so in deference to the wish of his Bishop. Both letters were answered the same day in a way most gratifying to the Bishop.<sup>1</sup> To Pusey the Bishop wrote again a somewhat lengthy letter in which the idea he had thrown out in his previous one took a more definite shape; while to Newman he wrote as follows:

### THE BISHOP OF OXFORD TO J. H. NEWMAN

Cuddesdon: March 19, 1841.

My dear Sir,—Though rather hurried by letters to-day, I should be sorry to let a Post pass without acknowledging yours, and expressing my gratification and thanks (tho' no more than I anticipated from the spirit shown in all former communications) at the kind manner in which you have received my letter, and my apprehensions of harm which might come from a continuation of discussion upon the Articles in 'Tracts for the Times,' judging by the sensation which the publication of the 90th has excited. Believe me that in anything I have said, or in anything I may hereafter suggest in a friendly manner; I am guided by a consideration for yourselves, and the great good which it is your power to effect, and which in many respects you have already done, as well as for the peace of the Church.

Believe me etc.,

R. OXFORD.

In re-reading this letter, probably some thirty years afterwards, Newman wrote on the top in pencil, 'To Pusey?' But it was not the letter which the Bishop wrote to Pusey, which was a much lengthier one.<sup>2</sup>

On returning to Oxford on the 19th Newman found Hook's letter awaiting him. He answered it the same day without alluding to the Bishop's letters to himself and Pusey, but clearly showing how alarmed he was.

<sup>1</sup> All four letters can be read in Pusey's *Life &c.* ii. 183-187.

<sup>2</sup> See Pusey's *Life*, ii. 187.

## J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. W. F. HOOK

Oriental: March 19, 1841.

Dear Hook,—Your letter is most kind. I am adding a postscript to my letter to Jelf and I will take notice of the points you mention. As to the notion of a Declaration, I have from the first said 'no' to it. I think our strength is to sit still. But one thing I am very anxious about, viz., that the bishops should not commit themselves to one view of the Articles. *This* is well worth your charitable exertions. I fear the Bishop of London, and the influence thence exerted upon our own diocese. But this in confidence

Many thanks indeed for your kindness, which I feel much.

As to your notion of a *University* Protest against the unauthorised act of the Heads of Houses, I hear people talking of this, and it is a very different sort of thing—but I suppose it will come to nothing.

Ever yours affectly,

J. H. N.

P.S.—With my postscript I shall have said in my letter to Jelf all I *can* say pretty nearly. I do earnestly intreat their Lordships to urge me no further.

It is a good joke—the Heads of Houses, I am told, now say that I have recanted in the letter to Jelf. On Friday night last, the 12th, I heard they meant to do something. On the 13th I wrote my letter. On the 14th (Sunday) I and others wrote to the V.C., Provost etc. begging they would suspend their decision till the letter appeared. On the 15th the letter was through the press, *and* the decision just got ahead of it by a few hours.

Hook replied on the 20th.

## REV. W. F. HOOK TO J. H. NEWMAN

My dear Newman,—I have acted on your hint and have just written a very strong and decided but respectful letter to the Bishop of London. Except to Pusey and

Palmer, you had better not mention this until you hear again. If the Bishop acts *rightly* he may not wish it to be known that I wrote to him ; if wrongly it will be time enough hereafter to mention that he did this in spite of a remonstrance. Thank dear good Palmer for his letter.

Yours affectly,

W. F. Hook.

What appears to be Bishop Blomfield's answer to Dr. Hook will be found in the latter's 'Life and Letters' (vol. ii. p. 64). The Bishop considered the 'tendency' of Tract 90 'to be most pernicious,' and 'what you say of a number of serious young men who might probably go over to the Church of Rome, if Mr. Newman were openly condemned is very alarming. . . It is to my mind the strongest possible evidence of the evil tendency of the Oxford Tracts that they should have made it necessary for Mr. Newman to put forth such a commentary on our Articles, to prevent his disciples from becoming papists.'

On the 20th Newman received the following letter from Dr. Todd.

REV. J. H. TODD TO J. H. NEWMAN

Trinity College, Dublin : March 18, 1841.

My dear Newman,—I wrote you a note a couple of days ago to introduce to you a very promising young clergyman, Mr. Lloyd, who has been ordered to relax a little for the benefit of his health, and intends to spend a few days at Oxford. I did not at that time know anything of the wonderful attack made upon you about the Tract No. 90, nor had anything of what has occurred reached my ears, or eyes, for I am out of the way of seeing newspapers, and have scarcely anybody here to speak to on such matters. However, I was this day sent from Oxford a copy of the resolution of the Vice-Chancellor and Heads of Houses of the 15th inst., and by the same post, a copy of your letter to Dr. Jelf. I cannot help writing to say how much I sympathise with you, although I trust that is unnecessary—nothing can be more true than what you say, that men's minds seem drawing towards a higher standard of Christian

feeling, than could satisfy the last generation, and that this seems going on quite independently of the exertions of individuals to promote it—better views seem springing up in different places, without any connection with others who held them before, as if the hearts of men were stirred by some superior power, and a yearning created for Catholic truth, even before it is known what Catholic truth in practice is.

I trust and pray that you may be guided in this crisis, and that the result may be for His glory, and the permanent good of this unhappy, divided and disunited Church, for I am more and more convinced that (humanly speaking) our only safety against the two streams of Popery and Puritanism that are beating upon us, is a return to what you truly say, is our native spirit. If the enemies of the Truth should succeed now in extracting from our Prelates or Universities any very strong condemnation of Church principles, the consequences may be very formidable.

One of my reasons for troubling you with these lines is to tell you that the four gentlemen, who have raised this storm, seem to be making every exertion to effect that object. I have just heard that they have sent their protest together with a copy of your Tract, to our Primate—and I presume they have done the same to the other Bishops. I do not know whether you would think it right to send copies of your letter to Dr. Jelf to the Bishops in the same way. The Primate, I have no doubt favours you in his heart, although he is very cautious about committing himself, and there is a large body of sound clergy in the diocese of Armagh. The Bishop of Elphin is also, I think, disposed to favour Church principles; and his son who has a great deal of influence with him. The Bishop of Cork is also very much in our favour, but he is timid, and greatly alarmed lest some people should go too far. He is also tremblingly afraid of the so-called Evangelical party, and labours to keep them quiet. The Bishop of Kildare is sound, but cautious, and the rest I need not speak of. You know the Bishop of Down yourself. How far it would be wise to appeal to the Bishops even so far as by sending

them your letter, may admit of discussion, and I can hardly venture to advise you, but there can be no harm in sending a copy to the Primate, as I know he has been appealed to by your opponents.

Ever sincerely yours,

J. H. TODD.

The Evangelicals of whom the good Bishop of Cork was 'tremblingly afraid' were particularly nasty over Tract 90; and altogether oblivious of their own equivocal position with regard to the Prayer Book. 'How had I done worse,' asked Newman in the 'Apologia,' 'than the Evangelical clergy in their *ex animo* reception of the Service for Baptism and the Visitation of the Sick?' And in a footnote he adds, 'For instance, let candid men consider the form of Absolution contained in the Prayer Book . . . I challenge, in the sight of all England, Evangelical clergy generally to put on paper an interpretation of this form of words, consistent with their own sentiments, which shall be less forced than the most objectionable of the interpretations which Tract 90 puts upon any passage of the Articles.' Of the Four Tutors, two, Mr. Churton and Mr. Griffiths, were Evangelicals. They were hardly the men 'to cast the first stone' at Tract 90. Neither, as the future was to show, were the other two better fitted for the work.

A good deal was heard of Mr. Wilson, whose name in the Letter of the Tutors came between those of Mr. Churton and Mr. Griffiths, some twenty years later. He was one of the contributors to 'Essays and Reviews' where he championed the use of 'forms of expression' which might be 'adopted with respect to the doctrines [of the Trinity and Incarnation] in the first five Articles without directly contradicting, impugning, or refusing assent to them, but passing by the side of them—as with respect to the humanifying of the Divine Word and to the Divine Personalities.'<sup>1</sup>

We now come to the one really important name among

<sup>1</sup> 'What is meant by "*passing by*," etc. . . . The clergy are bound by the King's declaration to take the Articles in their literal and grammatical sense; the first five Articles are the most important of all. Is it consistent with their literal and grammatical sense to pass them by? I think not. Is it consistent with the declaration that they are agreeable to the Word of God? If so, why pass by?' &c. Dr. Lushington's Judgment in the Court of Arches on *Essays and Reviews*, quoted in Pusey's edition of Tract 90, p. 33.

the four, that of Archibald Tait, the future Headmaster of Rugby, then Dean of Carlisle, then Bishop of London, and finally, Archbishop of Canterbury.<sup>1</sup>

In 1844 the Hebdomadal Board had three proposals ready to submit to Convocation. The first two had reference to W. G. Ward, and were to the effect that (1) certain passages in his 'Ideal of a Christian Church' were inconsistent with his good faith in subscribing to the Articles; and that (2) in consequence he should be deprived of his degrees. The third proposal took the form of a Test. It rendered any member of the University, who might be suspected of unsound views, liable to be called upon to declare that in subscribing to the Articles he took them in the sense in which 'they were first published and were now imposed by the University.' The Test raised such a storm of protest that it had to be withdrawn.

Among the most indignant of those who protested was Dr. Tait, then Headmaster of Rugby. His protest took the form of an open letter to the Vice-Chancellor.<sup>2</sup> The fact that he made a protest was not remarkable, but the grounds upon which he based it certainly were, when taken in connection with his procedure in the case of Tract 90. They shall be given as far as possible in his own words. First, however, let it be noted that he did not take the line of opposing the Test primarily on the grounds that nobody knew exactly what was the sense in which the Articles were originally intended to be taken, or in which, at any given time, the University might intend them to be taken, or whether the two senses must necessarily be one and the same. He eschewed such subtleties, and assumed

<sup>1</sup> He was the prime mover. The letter of the Four Tutors was an abridgment of one which he had originally intended to send in his own name alone. Besides inspiring the other three he saved them from a great blunder, if the following piece of contemporary gossip retailed by Frederick Temple can be trusted: 'One thing in the business [of Tract 90] reflects some credit on the "Canny Lion of the North"; his three brethren, it appears, were anxious not only to protest against the false doctrine of the Tract, but wished also to insert a scheme of the Church's (i.e. their) doctrine on the points in question; Tait, however, would not have anything to do with that. Just imagine what a glorious opportunity for Newman, if they had been fools enough to have answered his Ultra High Church Tract by a scheme of Ultra Low Church doctrine! He would have smashed them so completely that nobody would have liked to attack No. 90 again. But it certainly would have been very unlike Tait to have placarded an express opinion in his own name to the walls of the University.' —*Life and Correspondence of John Duke Lord Coleridge, Lord Chief Justice of England*, i. 98, 99.

<sup>2</sup> *A Letter to the Rev. the Vice-Chancellor of the University of Oxford*, etc. (Blackwood & Sons. 1845.)

that the Test would be, what it was intended to be, a means of insisting that the Articles should be taken literally. He objected to this being insisted upon because the Articles represented a 'method of theologising' which was quite out of date!

He begins by reading the Heads a lecture, the severity of which is in striking contrast with the uniform courtesy of Pusey and Newman over the matter of Tract 90. 'All men,' he informed them, 'have a tendency to think, as life advances, that public opinion cannot have entirely changed since they were young; and when sentiments are brought forward, which they never heard of in former times, they naturally enough conceive that these are merely the follies of youthful inexperience. . . . Now I confess that it appears to me that the Hebdomadal Board in their present praiseworthy efforts to vindicate the character of the Protestant University over which they preside, have fallen into this common error—that they have judged of the rising generation by what they remember of themselves' (p. 6). He had no objection, quite the contrary, to the first two proposals which dealt with Mr. Ward: 'I must confess that the most vital interests of the Church of England require some distinct announcement on the part of the University that the misinterpretation of the Articles which he advocates is inconsistent with his position as one of its authorised teachers' (p. 8). Special cases require special treatment. Mr. Ward's case was on a par with that of an M.A. who avowed himself a Socinian. Extreme cases such as these should be dealt with as they arose, and not made the pretext for sweeping legislation curtailing the liberty of persons deserving of every consideration.

'Of men below the age of forty-five throughout the kingdom, there may be a few—but they are very few, and their number is to be counted by units—whose mind is a sort of transcript of the Thirty-nine Articles and Prayer Book—who have so habituated themselves from their earliest years to look upon all which they find therein written as infallible, that their thoughts have never ranged beyond the prescribed limits' (p. 10).

The writer then went on to distinguish four theological schools 'according to which the younger members of the Church of England generally may be classed.' These were:

(i) The school which 'claims for itself the title of Anglo-Catholics' [i.e. the milder kind of Tractarians].

(ii) 'The small compact body of the decided followers of Mr. Newman, against whom the test is primarily directed.'

(iii) The Evangelicals.

(iv) 'A large and growing body of younger men, who are, for the most part, what is called Low Church in matters of discipline, and whose doctrinal theology is in a great measure modified, if not formed, by the study of the great Protestant writers of the Continent.'

The 'Anglo-Catholics' constituted the only party 'which at all approaches to such a method of theologising as that which I have now mentioned,' viz. the method of those whose minds were 'a sort of transcript of the Thirty-nine Articles.' It was 'the only one which can with any consistency support the proposition of the Board of Heads for a new Test.' But, as a matter of fact, so far as the writer could ascertain this party did not want the Test. It was hardly to be expected that they should, for it was 'against the very men [Mr. Newman and his followers] to whose earlier writings they know it to be owing that their favourite theology [presumably he meant the doctrines of the Apostolic Succession, and the Catholic Church] has been resuscitated from the deathlike slumber into which it had sunk' (pp. 11, 12).

The writer did not think much of the 'Anglo-Catholics.' They were 'respectable and amiable' but 'hardly deep thinkers,' not likely to be able 'to repel the assaults of infidelity, or to guide the burning thoughts of a generation displeased with its present state, and craving for something deeper and more truly earnest' (p. 10). This task was apparently reserved for the fourth school.

The party of Mr. Newman did not, of course, want the test. It was levelled at them.

The Evangelical party could only desire the test 'from a momentary forgetfulness, in the midst of conflict, of its own real position. It is impossible that the Divines of this school can be anxious for a more stringent assertion of their agreement in the doctrine of the Baptismal Service, or of the Catechism' (p. 15).

The fourth and last school, which 'my belief is, . . . contains by far the greatest amount of the talent of the rising generation' (p. 16)—whose 'theological sympathies' 'are at present very comprehensive, seeming almost to range from Mr. Carlyle or Schleiermacher on the one hand, to Mr.



Newman, or the Hermesianer of Germany, or Möhler's Symbolik on the other'—whose members 'will seldom be found to belong to any distinct party, but appreciating what is good and noble, and abhorring what is low and selfish in all' (p. 17)—which (p. 16) 'I suspect will soon be found to contain the best scholars, metaphysicians, and poets of the rising age' (p. 16)—which if it 'can be saved from too latitudinarian and rationalizing a spirit' . . . [is the school to which] 'we must look as the best hope of the generation which is to stand in our place when we are dead'—this school had trouble enough, with the Articles and the Prayer Book; more than was generally known, for it had not aired all its grievances. 'The damnatory clauses of the Athanasian Creed, and the 18th Article (to say nothing of many other points of difficulty which have not been made public by an appeal to Parliament), must of necessity warn them to pause, before they bind themselves more strictly than now to the letter of the Articles' (p. 15).

There was something lacking, one might perhaps call it a sense of seemliness or gravity, in the man who three years after he brought about the condemnation of Tract 90, thus championed the right of Broad Churchmen to what amounted to a wholesale non-natural interpretation of the Articles and the Prayer Book. It would have been better to leave this task to others.

This has been a lengthy digression, but the reader will, perhaps, pardon it when he is reminded of Newman's statement in the 'Apologia' that 'the men who drove me from Oxford were the Liberals.' Besides, an account, however compendious, of the condemnation of Tract 90, which passed over the views of those who brought it about, would be incomplete to the extent of being misleading.

Edward Bellasis (afterwards Serjeant Bellasis), in a letter to a friend of Newman's, wrote as follows from London:

EDWARD BELLASIS, Esq., TO REV. J. B. MORRIS

March 18, 1841.

. . . Generally speaking I find that those who had liked the previous Tracts like this, and attribute the attack on Newman to jealousy of the place he has for some time occupied at Oxford to the exclusion of their more dignified

selves. Whether this is a correct supposition I do not presume to determine, particularly as Newman suggests better motives in his letter to the V.C. . . . my own opinion of the Tract is of little moment, but it is decidedly this, that it is a true carrying out of principles that have been contained in the Tracts, and that to my mind it contains a 'wholesome doctrine and very necessary for these times.' Our London Rectors like your Oxford Heads are somewhat astonished and shake their heads, and others say 'so injudicious,' but I think that all those whose opinions you would have expected to be favourable are satisfied.

Another correspondent wrote as follows,

#### LETTER TO J. H. NEWMAN

. . . Is it not a little worth remarking in the proceedings of the Heads of Houses, that while they are so very much displeased at the notion of setting forth what things there are which we are not obliged to condemn simply because the Church of Rome enjoins them, (which our Articles set forth as a *church*), yet they testify no disapprobation of any expressions of charity, or sympathy, or agreement with bodies which are not Churches? We may soften down anything almost to show how blamelessly Dissenters might symbolise with us, how little [there is] with us which need be an offence to them, but must not say a word in the same strain as to Roman Catholics.

Among some criticisms which this writer made of the Tract was the following: 'I also regret the last paragraph containing the illustration from recent political manoeuvres in France. It carries an air of secret satisfaction at being able to parallel the words of our Reformers with something of low cunning if not of knavery.'<sup>1</sup>

On March 23 the Bishop of Oxford, who had been consulting with the Archbishop of Canterbury, wrote to Pusey inviting him over to Cuddesdon 'for a little private conversation on this painful position of things.'<sup>2</sup> Pusey went

<sup>1</sup> See p. 73.

<sup>2</sup> Pusey's *Life*, ii. 192.

the next day, and received from the Bishop the following proposals. (1) The Tracts should be discontinued; (2) Tract 90 should not be reprinted; (3) Newman should make it publicly known that this was done in deference to the Bishop's wishes. The negotiations which followed are fully described in Pusey's Life. Newman made no demur to the first and third of the proposals; but the second, the suppression of Tract 90, seemed to him very hard. If the Bishop insisted he would obey him; but then he must resign St. Mary's. He turned for advice to Hook and to Keble. To the former he wrote as follows:

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. W. F. HOOK

Oriel: in fest Annunc.: [March 25], 1841.

My dear Hook,—I write to you in some anxiety, and *quite* in confidence. I should like to have a line from you at once.

The Bishop wishes me, in a letter I am to write to him, to say that 'at his bidding I will suppress Tract 90.' I have no difficulty in so saying and doing, if he tells me, but my difficulty is about my then position. I shall then have been censured for an evasion by the Heads of Houses, with an indirect confirmation of it by the Bishop; for though he puts it on the ground of *peace*, people do not make nice distinctions. I cannot acquiesce or co-operate in such a proceeding. To condemn Tract 90 in the wholesale is to condemn its interpretation of Articles 6 [of the sufficiency of H. Scripture] and 11 [of Justification] quite as much as of 22 [of Purgatory, Pardons, Images etc.]. I am a representative at this moment of the interests of many: I cannot betray them.

It seems to me that I shall be observing my duty to the Bishop by suppressing the Tract, and my duty to my principles by resigning my living. Again, it is painful enough to be at St. Mary's with all the Heads against me, but if the Bishop indirectly joins them, what is to be my support? I cannot be a demagogue. The Bishop himself is all kindness, not so the authorities in London.

Though the Tract were suppressed, *answers* to it would be circulated freely, and there would be no lack of them. Bishops too, to a certainty are to charge. I cannot hold a living with such a force against me.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. N.

The letter to Keble is given in Miss Mozley's 'Life and Correspondence,' &c. It does not differ substantially from the one to Hook. The latter replied as follows—we give only the opening sentences :<sup>1</sup>

REV. W. F. HOOK TO J. H. NEWMAN

The Vicarage, Leeds : March 27, 1841.

My dear Newman,—I do not think you are in any way required to write as the Bishop of Oxford proposes. It is to your Bishop, not to Dr. Bagot that you are to yield obedience. Let Dr. Bagot act as your *Bishop* and all will be right. If he condemns you it will be in his Court and by his proper officers, but he cannot condemn you before you have obtained a hearing. You may demand permission to plead your cause and in so doing you may persuade him. It is most important at this time to act with due form, for our rights, as well as the authority of our rulers, are protected by forms ; and a regard to the proper forms will interpose that delay which may prevent the Bishop from acting rashly. . . .

The following was Keble's reply :

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

Hursley : March 26, 1841.

My dear Newman,—I am afraid I shall write very little to the purpose, but I must answer your letter just received as I can. I am very much concerned at it, and cannot but believe that so good a man as your Bishop will be somehow preserved from being the instrument of so bad a proceeding.

Certainly I do not see how it is consistent silently to

<sup>1</sup> The full letter can be read in Hook's *Life* &c. ii. 66.

suppress the Tract and go on as if the point was given up, even at a Bishop's command. The least you can do must be to get leave to accompany the suppression with a *public* declaration that you do so and so for obedience' sake, not at all giving up the view. If the Bishop allows this, he permits his clergy to hold the view, as consistent with the literal and grammatical sense, which is a great point gained. If he does not allow it, I do not see, unwilling as I am to come to the conclusion, how you can retain St. Mary's. And if you give it up on such a ground, I do not see how I and others in other dioceses can remain as we are without scandal. We must in some way or other declare our own sense of the Articles, by reprinting Tract 90, or writing fresh Tracts, or by direct application to our Bishops. I for one feel that I must do something, though I cannot clearly see as yet what that something would be. Otherwise we entangle ourselves in the snare of holding office, and receiving Church payments on an implied condition which we know in our hearts we are not fulfilling. In short there is no end to the serious results which such a step on the Bishop's part would have. The least that can be looked for is that he would drive some scores of us to lay communion.

I think you will be able to get this view laid before the Bishop, or rather to do it yourself in such a way as he will not misunderstand, and that he will on consideration waive the measure you speak of. If all the Bishops join, *that* is another thing: and will leave us, I imagine, no choice, unless by respectful remonstrance we could induce them to mitigate their sentence. It is a sad case, but we ought to be very thankful we have Lay Communion to fall back upon. I begin now to think that perhaps Pusey was right, and we ought to have moved—but I don't know. God bless and guide you.

Your ever affectionate,

J. K.

P.S.—E. Churton writes to Wilson very kindly, rather disapproving of No. 90, but much more of the Heads of Houses. He talks of some protest.

It is interesting to compare Keble's advice with Hook's. *Try to persuade the Bishop; if you cannot, obey and resign your living*, was that of the former. *Insist upon his acting constitutionally*, was that of the latter. There was much to be said for Hook's advice. The Bishop, in spite of all his kindness, was asking very much; and to make matters worse he could not protect those who submitted to him. The Evangelicals and Liberals were not troubled with 'high views' concerning episcopal authority. To keep their hands off Tract 90 and its author because he had satisfied his own bishop was almost the last thing in the world which it would occur to them to do. Neither would the other bishops refrain. But in spite of all this Hook's advice was not to Newman's taste. He has told us in the 'Apologia' what his views as an Anglican were with regard to episcopal authority. He considered each bishop 'as the one supreme authority in the Church, that is in his own place, with no one above him, except as, for the sake of ecclesiastical order and expedience arrangements had been made by which one was put over or under another.'<sup>1</sup> But, it might be asked, why not insist upon the Bishop observing legal forms? One cannot tell how he would have answered this question. Perhaps by asking another. By what authority in England were these legal forms restricting the divine authority of the Bishop imposed? Certainly not by that of the Universal Church. Or he might simply have said he did not like to contend with his Bishop.

Eventually the Bishop yielded the point of suppressing Tract 90; but he still insisted upon an open Letter to himself in which his judgment that Tract 90 is 'objectionable, and may tend to disturb the peace and tranquillity of the Church,' together with his 'advice that the Tracts for the Times should be discontinued,' was to be recorded. It was to be done *instanter*. This Newman agreed to do. His journal for March 29-31 is as follows:

*March 29.*—Manning went. J. W. went, and Church, Daman and Prichard. Wrote my Letter to the Bishop; it going to the press as I wrote it page by page. Dined in rooms early.

*March 30.*—The rest of the Letter through the press—dined early in rooms—letter seen by Pusey.

<sup>1</sup> *Apologia*, p. 107.

*March 31.*—And by the Archdeacon, who went over to Cuddesdon with it to the Bishop. Letter came out.

Two days later the Bishop wrote as follows :

THE BISHOP OF OXFORD TO J. H. NEWMAN

Cuddesdon : Friday, April 2, 1841.

My dear Sir,—I cannot let our late communications terminate without a few last words to express my entire satisfaction, and gratification with your letters received yesterday morning, both printed and written.

It is a comfort to me too (now that calm has, as I hope, succeeded the threatened storm) to feel assured, that though I have perhaps caused pain to one in whom I feel much interest, and for whom I have a great regard, you will never regret having written that letter to me. It is one calculated to soften and to silence opponents, as also to attach and to regulate friends, whilst the tone and temper of mind with which it is written must please and gratify all who read it.

Believe me, my dear Sir, faithfully yours,

R. OXFORD.

MRS. FROUDE TO J. H. NEWMAN

March 30.

My dear Mr. Newman,—I must trouble you again with a few lines to thank you for sending me the Tract and also to say that your secret is quite safe with us. Indeed we feel highly honoured to be the only people in the world besides two others who have a secret of yours in keeping. I was glad I did not write this yesterday, for I was (I must confess) sadly disappointed and very much disposed to be cross at the news contained in your note, viz., that ‘the Tracts were to cease at the Bishop’s expressed desire.’ It is indeed humiliating to find how human feelings mix themselves up with our good motives. I had fancied I only wished the advancement of your views for the sake of Truth, and yet I find in my mind that I was more vexed altogether

yesterday at thinking of the triumph of our adversaries, than at losing the Tracts for *their own sakes*.

But William took it in so different a way, and is so much quieter-minded, that he has much reconciled me to what has happened. He says he is quite sure that nothing could have passed which will tend more to advance the cause, and that there are quite Tracts enough published already to 'poison the universe,' and that the rapid sale of Tract 90 shows that you are like Samson and have slain more Philistines at your death than all you did during your life, for though many have, of course, bought Tract 90 only from curiosity, still, if they will read it, they will be sure to get some good from it, so I think one may see that one of the effects of this controversy has been to raise the tone of those who oppose you most decidedly.

I enclose you some Queen's heads [postage stamps], as William says I am to pay for the Tract in them. . . Pray do not trouble to answer this, and pray excuse it if I seem to you to write too familiarly, for somehow you have been so kind and friendly to me, that I never could write in a more formal way.

A Cambridgeshire clergyman wrote as follows on March 30 :

I have on more than one occasion expressed my gratitude for the benefit of your writings, not only as regards myself, but the church in this country at large ; and I feel it no more than due to truth . . . to express to you at this particular time, when you are as the writer of Tract 90 assailed with more than usual injustice, the effect of the Tract upon my mind and those with whom I am in the habit of comparing opinions. . . . I began to read the Tract with some alarm when I heard of the sensation it had made at Cambridge . . . my astonishment was never greater than when I got to the concluding words. . . . I hope there is no foundation for the report . . . that the Archbishop has forbidden the continuation of the Tracts. So absurd a thing cannot be true. But I am prepared for



anything after the late wicked caricature of the Sacrament in the Palace under his Grace's immediate sanction.

I am rejoiced with the Tract. Its notoriety will give notoriety to others that have preceded it . . . you have, I think, broken the chain which bound the Christian community to a deadly and deadening system—a system as remote from that which has been preserved to us in the Liturgy as truth is from its counterfeit etc.

Mr. Roundell Palmer (afterwards Lord Selborne) wrote on April 2 :

I have accidentally seen a proof copy of your letter to the Bishop of Oxford. I will never trust myself to form an opinion as to the future again if it does not do extensive good, and far over-balance any untoward consequences of late events. At any rate, I as an individual, feel deeply indebted to you for it.

A Gloucestershire Rector wrote on April 6 :

My dear Newman,—I think it is probable that about this time you will be receiving far too many letters for your convenience . . . still I am tempted to add to the number . . . my object is simply to express to you personally what (I see by my Oxford Paper) some persons . . . intend to express publicly in the way of Declaration.<sup>1</sup> The only part of that Document with which I am now concerned is that in which the subscribers 'gratefully acknowledge the eminent services which the Authors of the Oxford Tracts have done in recalling the public attention to the distinctive principles maintained by the Church of England in common with the whole Church of Christ.' I certainly hope to see that Declaration or some other to the same effect largely signed. Meanwhile this will tell you what that could not, that to one of those authors in particular I look with a great degree of affection as well as respect, and I firmly believe that the manner in which that affair of the Tract 90 has been

<sup>1</sup> The Declaration alluded to was drawn up by W. Palmer of Worcester. It was suppressed in deference to the Bishop of Oxford. See *Life of Pusey &c.* vol. ii. pp. 205 ff.

closed will establish the author in that position which it is most for the benefit of the Church that he should continue to hold. If I regret the Tract, I rejoice more in your letter to the Bishop. It must do great and lasting good.

On April 10, Newman wrote to a friend :

From what I am told, and from the letters every post brings from friends and strangers, I doubt very much whether the sum total of relief and comfort which Tract 90 has given, does not equal the sum total of the annoyance it has inflicted. I have no misgivings about it, nor have had. I feel it to have been necessary.

Robert Wilberforce wrote on April 8 :

. . . I know you are not a person who wishes for praise, but I hope that it will not be indifferent to you to receive the expression of my hearty sympathy and regard from the humblest member of Christ's Church. Respecting the prudence of publishing No. 90 I do not speak, but I am well satisfied that nothing can be more unjust than the attacks made upon it. Its main principles are proved beyond controversy. But your letter to the Bishop is written in a tone so calm, Christian, and convincing, that I am satisfied it will have great weight with all good men. I hope the inclination you there express to give up your Church at Oxford will not be acted upon.

A clergyman living at Bath wrote on April 9 :

He had been reluctant to write to Newman 'on an occasion like this when, if ever, a man ought to be accessible only to his *friends* strictly so called.' But he now felt 'it would be disingenuous, unjust, and unkind in one of the class for whose comfort and relief Tract 90 was written, and who has received *both* from it, not candidly to state as much, to thank you for it, and to place the statement, *tho' not his name* at your disposal' &c.

The following letter, with some others, was sent by Newman to his sister Mrs. J. Mozley. On the top of it is

written : ' My dear J.,—These letters are too kind to show to *anyone* but Aunt. Ever yrs, J. H. N.'

## FROM A COUNTRY CLERGYMAN

[April 9].

My dear Sir,—It will appear, I am afraid, great presumption in me that I should think of addressing you under your present severe trial, but I cannot resist doing so. . . . The grounds of comfort I can see, to any one else I should be apt to suggest, but to offer them to you would be folly in the extreme, knowing so much better as you do the ways of a merciful Providence. There is perhaps one thing I may be permitted to say, which is, that it seems to me a peculiar favour done you that your trial should be allotted you in the season of Lent when your own prayers and those of your friends can be offered up for you without distraction, for that we are to pray for you I needed not the admonition which I received from Jno Keble this morning, who cheers himself up with the sanguine hope of a blessing attending you from your 'behaving so well under very trying circumstances.'

That I have been bearing you in mind ever since I have read your most valuable 90th Tract the following passage from my Tuesday sermon may perhaps serve to show you, and for this purpose I send it to you, not with the foolish notion of suggesting grounds of comfort—'It seems to be a part of the nature of high truths to be received with an unkind welcome, and those therefore who were appointed to deliver them must look for bitter words, but submit to them meekly with the humble hope that the day will shortly come when these high truths will be discovered and valued, and then the deliverer of them will come to be loved, and these bitter words be reflected upon with sorrow, and the meekness with which they were received be duly prized.'

After saying this I must now come to discharge what I look upon as a duty, which is to thank you from my heart for the delight as well as benefit I have derived from

your Tract, the opposition to which I can account for in no other way than by supposing it is intended to give it a greater publicity, and advance the cause of Catholicity, &c.

On the same day, April 9, his sister, Mrs. J. Mozley, wrote to him :

Dear John,—I was only waiting till Aunt had finished reading your letter to the Bishop to write and thank you very much indeed for sending it to me, but more, I was going to say, for writing it. I really cannot but look upon that as a happy combination of circumstances which has extracted it from you, for I think it tends more to set your *character* in a true point of view to well disposed persons than anything you have hitherto written. I knew all this was in you, but you must be aware that to persons who have not been brought up with you, or long accustomed to your manner of thought, yours is a difficult character. There is something which seems almost paradoxical which they cannot understand. I suppose you had heard remarks of this sort made on your letter to the V.C., by your notice of it to the Bishop. I had— Some people could not quite understand that this was your habitual feeling—they thought you had written under some feeling of depression etc.<sup>1</sup> As to my opinion of your letter to the Bishop, I must say it seems to me quite perfect in its way, and I cannot fancy anybody reading it, unless they had a most fearful twist of mind without being mollified towards the writer . . . you are very kind to be thinking of us so much in the way of sending things that interest us, &c.

The correspondence connected with Tract 90 cannot be better concluded than with the following letter written by Newman in 1863.<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> The meekness of Newman's letter to the Vice-Chancellor seems to have given rise to the impression that he was cowed. It was the expression of his 'habitual deference to persons in station.' Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, last paragraph but one.

<sup>2</sup> For the circumstances under which this letter was written see Pusey's *Life*, iv. 1.

## TO THE EDITOR OF THE 'TIMES'

Sir,—It would be a great impertinence in me to say one word on the subject of the Oxford controversy which has lately occupied your columns, nor do I write this with any such intention. But Mr. Maurice has thought fit to introduce my name into his criticisms on Dr. Pusey, and to cast imputations on me, which, as a matter personal to myself, I think you will in fairness allow me to repel.

I would rather be judged by my own words than by Mr. Maurice's interpretation of them. I distinctly repudiate his accusation that I maintained, either in Tract 90 or elsewhere, the right of a man's subscribing to the Thirty-nine Articles in a non-natural sense. Nor ought he to speak from mere memory, as he seems to confess he did, when making a serious charge against another. I maintained in Tract 90 that the Thirty-nine Articles ought to be subscribed in their 'literal and grammatical sense'; but I maintained also that they were so drawn up as to admit, in that grammatical sense, of subscription on the part of persons who differed very much from each other in the judgment which they formed of Catholic doctrine.

I ask your permission to quote the passage to which Mr. Maurice refers :

' Their framers constructed them in such a way as best to comprehend those who did not go so far in Protestantism as themselves. Anglo-Catholics, then, are but the successors and representatives of those moderate Reformers; and their case has been directly anticipated in the wording of the Articles. It follows that they are not perverting, they are using them for an express purpose, for which, among others, their authors framed them. The interpretation they take was intended to be admissible, though not that which the authors took themselves. Had it not been provided for, possibly the Articles never would have been accepted by our Church at all. If, then, their framers have gained their side of the compact in effecting the reception of the Articles, let Catholics have theirs too in retaining the Catholic interpretation of them. . . . ' Tract 90, pp. 81 and 82 (first edition, February 1841).<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Via Media*, ii. 346.

After illustrating my position from Burnet, I end the Tract with the following allusion to M. Guizot and M. Thiers :

What has lately taken place in the political world will afford an illustration to point. A French Minister desirous of war, nevertheless as a matter of policy draws up his State papers in such moderate language that his successor, who is for peace, can act up to them without compromising his own principles. The world observing this, has considered it a circumstance for congratulation, as if the former Minister, who acted a double part, had been caught in his own snare. It is neither decorous or necessary, nor altogether fair, to urge the parallel rigidly ; but it will explain what it is here meant to convey. The Protestant profession was drawn up with the purpose of including Catholics, and Catholics now will not be excluded. What was an economy in the Reformers is a protection to us. What would have been a perplexity to us then is a perplexity to Protestants now. We could not then have found fault with their words ; they cannot now repudiate our meaning (p. 83).<sup>1</sup>

I will take this opportunity of adding that I never held that persons who subscribed the Thirty-nine Articles were at liberty to hold *all* Roman doctrine ; but I aimed in Tract 90 to open the Articles as widely *towards* all Roman doctrine as was consistent with that ' literal and grammatical sense ' which at p. 80 I professed to be maintaining.

I have wished to confine myself in the above to matters of fact ; and with the same view I am bound, in justice to Dr Pusey, to state, what perhaps no one but myself is in a position to testify—viz., that he had no responsibility in the publication of the Tract, and has no responsibility in regard to it to this day, except so far as he has in writing committed himself to portions of it, or to certain of its principles. He defended me, when it excited notice, from the generosity which is his characteristic ; but I am quite certain that he did not like it as a whole, and in all its parts.

I am, Sir, etc.

The Oratory, Birmingham,  
Feb. 24 [1863].

<sup>1</sup> *Via Media*, ii. 347.

## CHAPTER IV

### DR. RUSSELL AND NEWMAN, 1841

Dr. Russell of Maynooth, who 'had, perhaps, more to do with my conversion than any one else'—Thomas Scott, 'to whom (humanly speaking) I almost owe my soul'—Walter Mayers, 'who was the human means of this Beginning of Divine Faith in me.'—Correspondence with Dr. Russell and Wiseman.

TRACT 90 brought Newman into correspondence with one whose services to him he gratefully acknowledges in the 'Apologia,' his 'dear friend Dr. Russell, the present President of Maynooth, who had, perhaps, more to do with my conversion than any one else.' In striking contrast to the refined and scholarly Irish priest was another to whom Newman acknowledged himself a debtor—the stout old Calvinist, Thomas Scott of Aston Sandford, 'to whom (humanly speaking) I almost owe my soul.'<sup>1</sup>

Newman's indebtedness to Dr. Russell needs no explanation; but the precise nature of his obligations to Scott will not be so intelligible to the present generation as they were when the 'Apologia' was written. Scott (1747-1821) was a clergyman whom Newton, the spiritual guide of the poet Cowper, converted from Socinianism. Thorough Calvinist as he became, in intention at least, Scott's relations with his party were not always peaceful. He took up a strong line in inveighing against Antinomianism and insisting on the need of good works. This was distasteful to many persons, and thought by them to savour of Arminianism. They apparently wished him to confine his preaching to such topics as Justification by Faith only, Assurance, Predestination, and the like. Virtuous habits would be a matter of course with those who were spiritually minded. The following is a typical example of Scott's

<sup>1</sup> The following digression will, it is hoped, be excused, on the ground that it contains some facts connected with Newman's early life which seem worth rescuing from oblivion.

experience, as he describes it himself. He advertised a course of lectures on the Epistle to the Ephesians, to be delivered at the Lock Hospital in London. The lectures were well attended while he was going through the doctrinal part of the Epistle; but when he came to the fourth chapter, and spoke 'more particularly on Christian tempers and the relative duties,' there was an uneasiness which culminated when he preached on the words in the fifth chapter, *See that you walk circumspectly*, &c. 'The charge,' he says, 'was everywhere circulated that I had become an Arminian; and at once I lost half my audience.'

Newman studied Scott's writings when he was a boy of fifteen, and they planted deep in his mind the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. On the practical side—and this is worth noting—he admired in Scott 'besides his unworldliness, his resolute opposition to Antinomianism, and the minutely practical character of his writings.' 'I deeply felt,' he continues, 'his influence, and for years I used almost as proverbs what I considered to be the scope and issue of his doctrine, *Holiness rather than peace*, and *Growth the evidence of life*.'<sup>1</sup> These two maxims might almost be said to sum up the religious spirit of the Oxford Movement in its antagonism to Evangelicalism.

It seems likely enough that Scott's writings helped to preserve Newman from the subjectivism in religion, the tendency to dwell upon one's own feelings and emotions, as if they were the things that really mattered, instead of upon the objective truths of Revelation, which was one of the weak sides of much that was truly admirable in Evangelical piety.<sup>2</sup> Scott took up Evangelicalism because, as the story of his life seems to suggest, it was, in a latitudinarian age, the highest form of religion with which he became acquainted. Happier than Scott, Newman escaped from the prison-house, because he found at Oxford traditions

<sup>1</sup> *Apologia*, p. 15.

<sup>2</sup> Those who wish to understand the fearful evil which, in Newman's eyes, this subjectivism, or religion of feeling, was during the earlier part of the last century, should read his lecture on 'Preaching the Gospel,' in *Lectures on Justification*, pp. 312 ff. 'A man thus minded does not simply think of God when he prays to Him, but is observing whether he feels properly or not; does not believe and obey, but considers it enough to be conscious that he is what he calls warm and spiritual; does not contemplate the grace of the Blessed Eucharist, the Body and Blood of his Saviour Christ, except—O shameful and fearful error—except as a quality of his own mind.'—*Ibid.* p. 330.



and survivals of a deeper and, in the literal sense of the word, more refined religious spirit.<sup>1</sup>

Something may now be said about that 'excellent man, the Rev. Walter Mayers, of Pembroke College, Oxford, who was the human means of this beginning of divine faith in me.'<sup>2</sup> Mayers was Newman's classical master at Ealing School. He was an extreme Evangelical. A short 'Life' of him was published a year or two after his death. From this we learn that he had 'conscientious scruples in reference to the large portion of his time devoted to tuition.' He would have liked to devote himself entirely to his duties as a clergyman. But this was impossible, for he had relations largely dependent upon him so 'he became more reconciled to his situation, and endeavoured to redeem a portion of the time devoted to classical studies, for religious instruction. Little encouragement was derived, in consequence of the apparent indifference with which his devotional exhortations were received; he had, however, reason subsequently to rejoice in the fruit of his labours; some of his pupils, who were eminently distinguished for their superior talent and classical attainments in the University of Oxford, having likewise become zealous servants of the Lord. The path of duty eventually proves the path of pleasantness and way of peace, nor will the believer ever regret following its course.'

Little did the zealous biographer dream that the fruits of Mr. Mayers' pathetic endeavours were to be something more than a slight increase of the number of Evangelical clergymen who had taken good degrees!

Mr. Mayers deserved something better than to have his life written in the style and terminology of an Evangelical tract. Newman did more justice to his memory in a few simple words which he spoke at his funeral:

'His was a life of prayer. The works and ways of God, the mercies of Christ, the real purposes and uses of life, the unseen things of the spiritual world, were always uppermost

<sup>1</sup> One must not, however, overlook what Newman owed to the writings of the early Fathers, to which his attention was first directed by an Evangelical Church History.

<sup>2</sup> *Apologia*, p. 4:

in his mind. His speech and conversation showed it. . . . It pleased God to show to all around him the state of his heart and spirit, not only by the graces of a meek and peaceable and blameless conversation (which is, of course, displayed by all good Christians), but also by the direct religiousness of his conversation. Not that he ever spoke for the sake of display—he was quite unaffected, and showed his deep religion quite naturally.'

Yet, in spite of his admiration for good men among the Evangelicals, in spite of his indebtedness to many of their writers, Newman's judgment went dead against their system. The truth is, he never was a real Evangelical; he never passed through the conventional experiences—'conviction of sin, terror, despair, news of the free and full salvation, apprehension of Christ, sense of pardon, assurance, joy, and peace,' &c. Of his conversion, when he was fifteen, i.e. of the fact that he then 'fell under the influences of a definite creed,' and received into his intellect impressions of dogma, which, through God's mercy, have never been effaced or obscured'—of this he was as certain as that he had 'hands and feet,' but it did not pass through the conventional stages. So little was it according to rule, that after he had described it in the 'Apologia,' people used to write to him, telling him that 'he did not yet know what conversion meant, and that the all-important change had still to be wrought in him if he was to be saved.'<sup>1</sup>

When Newman left Ealing, in December 1816, Mr. Mayers gave him, as a parting gift, Bishop Beveridge's 'Private Thoughts.' It was forwarded with the following rather wistful letter:

Ealing, 31 December, 1816.

My dear Friend,—With this you will receive Bishop Beveridge's 'Private Thoughts,' of which I beg your acceptance as a small token of my affectionate regard. On perusing it, you will see that the opinions which we have discussed, though at present *singular* are not *novel*, nor are they without authority, for they are deduced from the only authentic source. To that source let me direct your atten-

<sup>1</sup> *Autobiographical Memoir, Miss Mozley's Letters and Corr.*, vol. i. p. 108:

tion. Be more disposed to form your sentiments upon religion from that, than to adapt and interpret it to your opinions. I have, of course, had somewhat more experience of what is called the world, but I can assure you there is no real or substantial happiness to be found in its vain and unprofitable pursuits. We are candidates for eternity, and should live as such ; if we do not, we shall bitterly lament our folly in that day when time is no more, and all that is human shall appear divested of every disguise. If you know me, you will not suppose I would discourage activity or exertion in the profession which may be selected for you, or that I would encourage melancholy views. Seek *first* the Kingdom of God and His righteousness is a precept which reminds us something is to be the *secondary* object, and the exhortation to Rejoice in the Lord always, may admonish us that the Christian only has a right to joy, because he only can rejoice in the Lord. Did you ever read Doddridge's ' Rise and Progress,' or Law's ' Serious Call ' ? both admirable pieces of practical Divinity. When you are settled at the seat of learning, I shall hope to hear of your proceedings. I write this in the midst of packing, as I intend to leave in the morning. To-morrow will commence a new year ; may it be propitious to you, about to embark on the tempestuous ocean of life—not, I hope, without a helm.

Yours affectly.,

W. MAYERS.

The religious principles which Mr. Mayers instilled into his pupil's mind were new to him. *There was no trace of Calvinistic teaching in Newman's home.* This was positively affirmed in later years by his sister, Mrs. J. Mozley.<sup>1</sup> His father most certainly was not an Evangelical ; and there is not a particle of evidence that his mother had any leanings that way. Further, the religious atmosphere of

<sup>1</sup> See Appendix I. It may be observed that Calvinist and Evangelical seem often to have been used as synonymous terms. The majority of the early Evangelicals were Calvinists, though there was a substantial minority which was not. It should be remembered that those who were Calvinists did not make much, as a rule, of the Calvinistic doctrine of Predestination, which horrifies those who do not hold it.

Ealing School seems not to have been distinctively Evangelical. The coldness with which the boys received Mr. Mayers' devotional exhortations, the fact that in his letter he speaks of the 'opinions' which he and Newman discussed as being 'singular,' both suggest that he was trying to introduce something new into the school. It may also be noted that the boys used to act the plays of Terence. Newman himself was one of the characters in a play which some forty years later he made more suitable for the present day, and renamed the 'Pincerna.' Now, considering the aversion which strict Evangelicals had for the theatre, it seems improbable that a school which was intended to meet their requirements should go out of its way to have plays at all. But this is a point which it would require a minute knowledge of the customs of the times to speak upon with confidence.

Newman, nearly sixty years afterwards, wrote in the little volume given him by Mr. Mayers, in which the above letter was carefully preserved, the following memorandum: 'This work is not mentioned in my "Apologia," because I am speaking there of the formation of my doctrinal opinions, and I do not think they were influenced by it. I had fully and eagerly taken up Calvinism into my religion before it came into my hands. But no book was more dear to me, or exercised a more powerful influence over my devotion and my habitual thoughts. In my private memoranda I even wrote in its style.'<sup>1</sup>

It is a pity that he did not state which among the doctrines of Calvinism were most eagerly taken up by him; but the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination was almost certainly not one of them. Indeed this doctrine does not seem to have exercised much influence even upon those of the Evangelicals who were most staunch in their Calvinism. They believed in it without assimilating it. The doctrines, apart from those common to all or to nearly all Christians, which really seem to have moulded their hearts and minds were: (1) Total Depravity—that is, the belief that human nature was entirely corrupted by the Fall; (2) that Justification is the *imputing* of righteousness, not the *bestowal* of it. Of these doctrines the former kept its hold

<sup>1</sup> Just as Newman was able to throw himself into the minds of others, so, when he was young, he could catch the style of any writer who took his fancy.

upon Newman much longer than the latter. It is perhaps the subtle but all-pervading influence of these two doctrines on the minds of persons who really embraced them, that accounts for a certain sense of oppression which steals over the mind of those who try to read the books which influenced Newman in his youth.

Beveridge's 'Private Thoughts' is a solid treatise on the duties of a Christian life. It is severe in its tone, and makes no appeal to the imagination or to the emotions. Most persons would think twice before placing it in the hands of a beginner, for fear lest its austerity might repel him. The event, however, fully justified Mr. Mayers' prudence as a spiritual guide. It speaks much for the maturity of Newman's religious life when he was only sixteen, that such a book should have captivated him. It is as if a Catholic boy of the same age were to fasten eagerly upon Rodriguez, or the devotional writings of Blosius and Bona. Those who are fond of associating Newman's memory with that of St. Philip Neri, the founder of the Oratory, will recall the account, given by Bacci, of the saint's early days, how 'his devotion had a certain maturity about it. It did not consist in those exhibitions of childish piety, which are laudable enough in themselves, such as dressing little altars and the like, but in praying, reciting psalms, and, above all, in eagerly listening to the Word of God. He never spoke lightly, as boys will do, of becoming a priest or a monk, but concealed the wish of his heart, and began even from his childhood to shun all parade, of which he was ever an implacable enemy.'<sup>1</sup> In many respects Newman was a ready-made disciple of St. Philip before he came to know him; in none more than in his implacable hostility to all parade. But a comparison between St. Philip and Newman is a domestic matter which one has hardly a right to intrude upon the reader.

To go back to Dr. Russell.<sup>2</sup> His study of Leibnitz, whose 'System of Theology' he translated a few years

<sup>1</sup>Bacci's *Life of St. Philip* (English translation), i. 5, 6.

<sup>2</sup>Born in 1812, died in 1880. The account of Dr. Russell's literary labours in the short biography of him in the *Dictionary of National Biography* shows him to have been a man keenly interested in the advancement of learning, and quite indifferent to personal renown. In the course of his life, he refused two bishoprics and one archbishopric. He was only thirty when Gregory XVI chose him to be the first Vicar-Apostolic of Ceylon, and he had to go to Rome to escape the burden,

later, disposed him to watch with interest any signs of a revival of Catholic doctrine in the Reformed Churches. He was one of the very few among the Catholic clergy to encourage Dr. Wiseman, with whom he was co-editor of the 'Dublin Review,' in the favourable view which he took of the Tractarians. 'Newspaper assaults,' Wiseman complained, 'remonstrances by letter (and from some of our most gifted Catholics), sharp rebuke by word of mouth and resisting to my face, were indeed my portion.'<sup>1</sup> It took Dr. Russell a long time before he could summon up courage to write to the great Oxford divine, for, besides being a comparatively young man, he was one whom it cost an almost heroic effort to bring himself forward. But at last, as often happens in such cases, he made up his mind quite suddenly. He had read Tract 90, and was deeply pained by the parts which treat of the 28th Article and the condemnation of the doctrine of Transubstantiation. It was suggested in the Tract that the framers of the Article had chiefly in their minds a gross view about the doctrine in question. The natural inference was that this view was current at the time of the Reformation. One shrinks from describing this supposed view. All that need be said is, that he would be a very ingenious man who could reconcile it with the teaching contained in the following lines of the *Lauda, Sion*, a hymn which was as familiar to the early Reformers as 'Lead, kindly Light' is to modern Englishmen :

Nulla rei fit scissura,  
Signi tantum fit fractura,  
Qua nec status nec statura,  
Signati minuitur.

REV. C. RUSSELL TO J. H. NEWMAN

Maundy Thursday [April 8, 1841].

Reverend Sir,—The amiable and unassuming spirit which pervades all your writings induces me to hope that the following observations, although they come from an

<sup>1</sup> Quoted from an 'Autobiographical Fragment' published in the *Ushaw Magazine*, March 1916. For two adverse judgments, delivered, as is evident from their style, by men sure of an attentive hearing, see Newman, Letter to Dr. Pusey (*Anglican Difficulties*, ii. pp. 4, 5).

humble Irish Catholic priest, will not appear, at least offensively, obtrusive. If any apology be necessary, I trust I shall not offend your delicacy by pleading the kind and benevolent disposition which I cannot help reading in all, especially your more recent publications. I write in no vain or forward spirit. I have not communicated my intention to any person—I have never seen you, nor do I see any reason to hope for that honour. And yet I cannot bring myself to look on you as a complete stranger. I have long regarded with the deepest interest the very remarkable movement which originated in your exertions. I can scarcely account, even to myself, for the strangely powerful impulse by which I am drawn towards yourself, personally a stranger in all except your admirable writings.

It grieves me, therefore, to observe, that, amid the varied and profound erudition in all that concerns your own Church which your works display, there is to be met much misapprehension of many doctrines and practices which I have been taught since childhood to venerate, and which, were they indeed as you represent them, I should abhor as fervently as you yourself can do. I need hardly [say] that I do not hope to discuss them all in the compass of a letter, for the perusal of which I can only reckon on the candour which I believe to characterise you. I perceive from the public prints, that a prelate, whom I venerate and love, has undertaken the task—I well believe in the most kind and friendly spirit. But I trust that the date of this letter will sufficiently explain why I take the liberty of calling your attention to *one* precious doctrine in particular—that of the Blessed Sacrament—a doctrine, I doubt not, as dear to you as it is to myself.

I beg, then, with the most respectful earnestness, to assure you that you have utterly misconceived our belief upon this point, raising up to yourself in it horrors, which every member of our Church discards as impious and revolting.

In explaining the 28th Article you write (No. 90, p. 47) : 'What is there opposed as "Transubstantiation" is the shocking doctrine that the "body of Christ," as the Article

goes on to express it, is *not* "given, taken, and eaten, after a heavenly and spiritual manner, *but is carnally pressed with the teeth*, that It is a body and substance," etc.

Your whole exposition of this Article proceeds on the supposition that our conception of 'Transubstantiation' is of the most gross and repulsive nature, that we think of the adorable Body of Our Lord in the Eucharist as *of an earthly and fleshly thing*; of the eating and drinking as animal and corporeal actions, a carnal eating—it is painful to write it in this sense—'tearing with the teeth,' of the Blessed Body—a natural and bloody drinking of the adorable Blood.

That you should explain the Article of your Church in the most Catholic sense of which the words or the circumstances render them susceptible, far from complaining, I rejoice and am sincerely thankful. But I equally lament that this explanation of your own belief should involve the imputation upon us of doctrines as odious and repulsive, as they are opposed to our true creed. It is to this I beg to call your attention in the spirit of most respectful, but, I must add, of most earnest remonstrance. Far from entering in any way into our belief of the Eucharist, the gross imaginations ascribed to us are rejected with horror by every Catholic; and you will find in Veron's 'Regula Fidei' (a small volume which I earnestly recommend to your notice, and which I should feel most grateful if permitted to send you) how far we may go upon the opposite side without trenching upon Catholic principles ('Reg. Fid.,' c. 11, n. 4) It is true that in the statement of our doctrine, very strong language has occasionally been employed by our divines, of which Bishop Taylor, as cited by you, produces some examples. But these expressions are always understood in a sense quite different from that which you attribute to them. In the passages quoted from Bellarmine by Bishop Taylor, and also by Dr. Pusey in his letter to the Bishop of Oxford (p. 134, I believe), a limitation is appended which is altogether omitted by the latter, and imperfectly stated by the Bishop, but which, notwithstanding, divests it of all its offensiveness. In explaining the abjuration of Beren-



garius (which you yourself bring forward), Bellarmine expressly declares that the Body of the Lord is seen, touched, broken, and bruised, through *the medium of the species*, which ALONE are formally touched, seen, broken, and bruised (Lib. iii. cap. 23, answer to the 4th objection); and he rejects as impious and horrible (Lib. i. cap. 7, object. 4) the 'Capharnaite' conception of the mode of eating, which Bishop Taylor accuses him of adopting. It is thus the Church understands the phraseology employed in the retractation of Berengarius, which, however strong it may appear, can scarcely surprise us when we remember *the evasions by which he had explained away his former abjuration*, and which, by using the strongest language, it was intended to exclude from the new one.

Rest assured, therefore, that you have completely misconceived us; and attribute to the necessity of excluding cavils, as offensive to your notions as to ours, the strong, and sometimes [coarsely]<sup>1</sup> sounding language occasionally employed, but always understood with the limitation *mediantibus speciebus*. It may be useful to remind you that the *very strongest* phrases are transcribed *literally* from the Catholic Fathers. Of the annexed extracts from St. John Chrysostom, *three* are cited by Bellarmine *in the very passage objected to him*.

(1) 'To those who desire it, He hath given Himself not only to see, but to *touch*, and to eat, and to fix *the teeth in His flesh*' [ἐμπήξαι τοὺς ὀδόντας τῇ σαρκί], 46th Hom. on St. John, Lect. 3, vol. viii. p. 72. *Bened Ed.*, Paris, 1728.

(2) 'Of what sun-like brilliancy should the hand be, which *cutteth the Flesh asunder*,' 82nd Hom. on Mat., sec. 5, vol. vii. p. 788.

(3) 'Behold thou seest, *touchest*, eatest Him,' *ib.*, sec. 4.

(4) 'He gives Himself to thee, not to see only, but to *touch*, to eat, to receive within,' p. 787.

(5) 'But why do we add "which we brake"? for thou mayest see that this is done in the Eucharist,—What He did not suffer on the Cross, this He beareth for thee in the

<sup>1</sup> The writing here is illegible.

Oblation, and submitteth to be broken (*ἀνέχεται διακλώμενος*) to fill all.'

In more than one passage of the Tracts the policy of our Church in defining the mode of the Mysterious, is condemned as presumptuous, and is elsewhere condemned in less measured terms. I, on the contrary, regard the very stringency of the definitions as under Heaven the great preservative of our Faith; and it has always appeared to me that the universal and contemptuous forgetfulness in your Church of this heavenly truth, until revived by your own enthusiastic and ill-requited exertions, might have taught you the wisdom of that ancient policy which, avoiding the human device of 'open questions,' has always, as each new heresy arose, shut out controversy in all essentials for ever, by a clear and stringent definition.

Permit me, again, Reverend Sir, to apologise for this ill-timed, perhaps, but certainly not ill-meant or [un-generous]<sup>1</sup> communication. I trust my motives, which, believe me, are of a higher order, will not be misunderstood. I have long felt a warm, though distant and respectful interest in all that concerns you. I have watched with anxiety any approximation to that faith which is my dearest and highest hope, and at the altar of which I am an unworthy minister, I never fail to remember you in my worthless prayers.—I have the honour to remain, Rev. Sir, with the utmost respect,

Your obt. servant,

C. RUSSELL.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. C. RUSSELL

Oriel College, April 13/41.

Dear Sir,—Nothing can be kinder or more considerate than the tone of your letter, for which I sincerely thank you. It will relieve you to know that I do *not* accuse your communion of holding Transubstantiation in the shocking sense which we both repudiate, but I impute that idea of it to our Articles which, I conceive, condemn a certain

<sup>1</sup> The word used is not legible.

extreme view of it which some persons or party [?] in your Church have put forward against the sense of the sounder portion of it I am quite aware of Bellarmine's explanations; I am aware that well-informed R.C.'s hold the spiritual presence in the Eucharist; but should be very loth to think that our Article was regarding such a belief when it spoke of Transubstantiation. If I have not said so in the Tract, it was because my object in it was not to defend you, but to exonerate our Articles from what is traditionally imputed to them. And in doing so I was taking the line of your own writer Davenport, or a Sancta Clara, who, if I mistake not, commenting on this particular Article, says, 'Capharnaitarum haeresim procul dubio spectat.'

I heartily wish that I could extend to all your received doctrines the admission I make concerning this—which is that you have adopted a word 'Transubstantiation' conveying a wrong idea, which practically you explain away.<sup>1</sup> O that you would reform your worship, that you would disown the extreme honours paid to St. Mary and the Saints, your traditionary view of Indulgences, and the veneration paid in foreign countries to Images. And as to our own country, O that, abandoning your connection with a political party, you would, as a body, 'lead quiet and peaceable lives in all godliness and honesty.' It would do your religious interests as much good in our eyes, as it would tend to rid your religious system of those peculiarities which distinguish it from primitive Christianity.

I will thankfully accept Veron's book at your hands, if there is any easy mode of conveyance for it.

I am etc.

REV. C. RUSSELL TO J. H. NEWMAN

St. Patrick's College, Maynooth:  
Feast of St. Anselm (April 21 1814).

My dear Sir,—I had left Dundalk on my way here, where I hold the chair of Humanity, before your letter arrived. The delight which it gives me has thus been

<sup>1</sup> What did he mean by 'conveying a wrong idea'?

delayed for some days. I cannot say how grateful I am for the kind and cordial spirit in which it is written, nor how much I am consoled by the information it contains. I wrote from impulse rather than from reflection. I had just returned from the affecting service of our Church on Holy Thursday. The striking passage from St. Augustine which we read in the Matins of that day was fresh upon my mind; the mystery of the day itself filled me with deep sorrow that there should be any to misunderstand; and, although I felt the boldness, and, perhaps, indelicacy, of addressing a stranger upon a topic so solemn, yet I trusted that I could not err much in yielding to the feelings which prompted me to write. Your kind letter completely reassures me. I find that I have not erred in the estimate which your writings led me to form of you; and I thank God for the consoling knowledge that full justice is at length rendered to a doctrine which, if it be permitted to distinguish, may well be termed the most striking evidence of His love for us.

Believe me, my dear Sir, our other doctrines, and the practices which flow from them, will bear the same rigid examination, and it is only when searched in a Catholic spirit, like that with which God has singularly blessed you, that their full character is felt and appreciated. Leibnitz, the great antagonist of Bossuet, had seen and studied them in all their phases, and he is the only uncatholic writer (if I may indeed call him so) who has done them full justice. I am sure you will read his *Systema Theologicum* (pp. 103, 201) with great pleasure. With how different feeling, for example, would you regard the religious honours of the adorable Eucharist from what you should have had before—if I be right in supposing such a time—you came to know with us 'that which lieth hid within.' And be assured if you knew us well, our doctrine on the Blessed Virgin and the other Saints, if you knew the correctness of the views entertained by our very rudest people on the value of Indulgences and the use of Sacred Images, your fears of our 'traditional system' would disappear—you would feel that our worship

needed no 'reform'—you would be less disposed to regard our honour of the Saints as 'extreme,' or to be offended by our 'traditionary view of Indulgences.' Where can the true spirit of our devotions be traced so surely as in the devotions themselves? Examine these, and you will cease to fear them. Every *Hymn* has its doxology—every Litany begins with a prayer for mercy to the *Blessed Trinity*, and after asking the *prayers* of the *Saint* or *Saints*, closes with a supplication again for *mercy* to the *Lamb of God*: every Prayer terminates by assigning the Merits of our Lord as the ground of its petitions, and the Rosary, which is considered the most offensive of all, is but a series of meditations on the Incarnation, Passion, and Glory of our Redeemer. If I had no other security that these tender and consoling devotions, far from defrauding the worship of God, on the contrary elevate it, and give it that stability which our weak and frail hearts require, I should find it in the fact that the holiest servants of God—those like St. Bernard, or, in later times, Francis Xavier, or Vincent of Paul, whose souls burnt on earth almost with a seraph's fervour, whose piety towards God was of the sublimest as well as tenderest character—were also, in the same proportion, the most devoted clients of the Mother of God, and the humblest suitors for her intercession.

But even though your views were correct in point of fact as to the dangerous tendency of what you conceive to be our 'traditionary system,' how much greater the peril of salvation for an ordinary Christian in your own communion, where the blessed doctrines to which your dearest hopes, as well as mine, must cling, are barely (and, indeed, not even so,) tolerated, where all your learning and all your moderation can scarcely ensure even this for them, when the very attempt has raised a storm such as our days have never seen before; and when, on the other hand, the uncatholic (and may I add almost unchristian) views were those of the mighty majority, and most probably remain so even still, when, according to yourself, there is no positive creed (but only articles of peace) upon many

points which I cannot conceive how any one, once admitting, can regard as unessential, and when the public formularies do not exclude from the highest dignities, and, I believe, cannot, such men as Hoadley, and Watson, and Balguy.

Pardon me that I write thus freely. I trust you will believe it is due to no unworthy spirit. To you who have borne with me so patiently until now, I do not fear to avow the conviction, which I should scarcely venture to make public, that in the mysterious views of Providence, a great change is gradually coming upon us, even without ourselves. Every day, every new event, increases the confidence with which I put up my humble prayers that I may be permitted to see it fully accomplished—to see your Church once again in her ancient and honourable position, to have the happiness of knowing that you and your devoted friends are ministering to the same altar to which my own life is vowed. I have long regarded you all as brethren in spirit, separated only from us because we did not know each other; and although I was often afflicted by the misconceptions and mis-statements which this want of knowledge occasioned, yet I could not help but forget and forgive it all for the sake of the Catholic germ<sup>1</sup> which lay beneath, and which was quickening even the cold and languid and [*word illegible*] forms into life and vegetation, and, under God's grace, was forcing its way through the stiff and unpromising soil upon which it had fallen. Oh! may you find your best reward in restoring to your beloved and revered Church the glory, which, alas, she has lost. Human means will never effect this change. Bossuet and Leibnitz failed of success. I do not myself see the means. But my hope is not therefore the less strong. I believe, with all the fervour of my heart, that once again the 'weeks will be shortened upon our people, that transgression may be finished, and sin may have an end.' And I am equally persuaded that in the wondrous ways of God, you and your friends have been especially raised up, imbued with an especial spirit, and fitted with peculiar powers for its accomplishment.

<sup>1</sup> Word uncertain.

Our political position is, indeed, an unhappy one ; but it is the result of circumstances which, as they created, may, and, I trust, will amend it. We have suffered much, and however it is to be deplored, one can hardly wonder at the violence of the reaction which long continued oppression has produced. Would that I could see my Catholic countrymen freed from a political connexion with those with whom they have not, and cannot have any community of religious interest, and religious feeling !

But I am forgetting myself and overtaxing you. My heart, I believe, has outrun my judgment, and I have not cared to check it in the belief that you will not misconstrue my words nor misinterpret my motives.

I shall be delighted to have ' Veron ' left at Messrs. Rivington's, who, I doubt not, will do me the favour to send it forward. The volume contains two other works, neither of great interest, with itself. Perhaps when you read it you may remember that it comes from one, who, though a stranger, feels and prays fervently for your best and highest interests.

I remain, my dear Sir,

Yours faithfully in our Lord,

C. H. RUSSELL.

Newman's answer to this letter has not been found among his papers. But it seems very probable that it was the letter of April 26, 1841, quoted in the ' Apologia ' (p. 187).

#### REV. C. RUSSELL TO J. H. NEWMAN

May 1, 1841.

My dear Sir,—Knowing the numerous and pressing calls upon your time to which your present position necessarily exposes you, I should not think of prolonging a correspondence which, however gratifying and consoling to me, has been, I feel, an unwarrantable tax upon one so peculiarly engaged as you, were it not that I am anxious to assure you how heartily I unite in the concluding wish of your letter. I feel that it is only through that humility

and single mindedness—to be obtained by prayer alone—that we can ever hope for a great movement to which many human obstacles oppose themselves; and I, with many warm and zealous friends, who think and feel with me, have long made this the object of earnest prayer, especially at the Holy Altar. I propose to myself a visit, during the summer months, to France, Rome, Austria, and Bavaria. In a first visit the religious settlements of these countries will be the principal objects of interest to me, and I trust I shall leave behind me, among the members of each, the same kind and charitable feeling. My hopes, although later events have confirmed and exalted them, are not of recent origin. In a short review of a remarkable German work—Höninghaus' 'Wanderings through the Domain of Protestant Literature'—which I wrote in the 'Dublin Review' a considerable time ago, (No. XIV. 1) you may find the very same sentiments which I should write to-day—bating one or two little words from which I should now abstain. May He, who alone can grant that these hopes prove not too sanguine—may He, to use the words of your *Ecclesiastical Almanac*, which I have just examined with the greatest interest, 'hasten that union and make us worthy of entering into it.' You will remember that when I spoke of your Church, I contrasted it, not with Protestant Churches but with our own. I never dreamed of saying (God forbid!) that there are not many of her members at the present day who earnestly 'aim at being Catholic in heart and doctrine.' But I expressed my belief that this struggle must carry them *beyond* if not *against* the public formularies of their faith, and that it required all your learning to demonstrate that it was not so. And my idea in that contrast was this: that the position, in your communion, of an individual so disposed, was far more perilous than it would be in ours, even supposing that there were extremes among us; because with us Catholicism is the rule, and these extremes, if they existed, would be but accidental exceptions; while with you, until of late years even the shadow of Catholicism had been unknown for an entire century; and now-a-days though



the spirit is rapidly spreading, it is still, I fear, though I trust not [for] long, the exception—it is a stranger, as it were, among your institutions, which if they were not made *against*, certainly were not designed *for* it, and, if it could live at all should live *in spite* of them, instead, as with us, borrowing *strength and vitality* from their aid. In other words I wished to say that for an ordinary Christian (and it is for these the Church must best provide) the danger of lapsing from Anglicanism into Protestantism in its most naked forms, is fearfully greater than that of falling among us from the doctrines of the Council of Trent into superstition or idolatry. To my mind there is much significance in this contrast, remembering, as I must, how much we depend on external things and circumstances, not only for our actual thoughts, but for the habit and colour of our minds.

‘I pray daily,’ he writes in the concluding portion of the letter, ‘that you and your friends may be strengthened to dismiss all fears of that secondary and traditionary system among us, which seems to haunt you. Believe me, my dear Sir, it has no existence in fact. . . . I am as confident as I can be of my own belief that had you the same sources (and God will give them to your prayers) of information, you would believe with me that your fears are groundless.’

Newman’s answer to this letter, dated May 5, 1841, can be read in the ‘Apologia.’

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO DR. WISEMAN (rough draft)<sup>1</sup>

April 3, 1841.

Mr. Newman has just received the Bishop of Melipotamus’s published Letter and offers him his best acknowledgments of it. He assures the Bishop that in what he has said in his Letter to Dr. Jelf concerning the received system in the Church of Rome, he had no intention of assailing or insulting that communion, but merely wished to state *what*

<sup>1</sup> Acknowledging the receipt of a published Letter addressed to him.

his own view of it was. He had been challenged to state his view of it, and he stated it as a fact. He may be wrong in it; if so he is quite willing to be proved wrong; and if he is ever convinced that he is wrong, he will say so. It has somewhat pained him to find that the Bishop considers that he is 'eager to seize on a prejudice existing against the Roman Catholics in the minds of his own Churchmen, as a shield to cast between himself and their attacks.' This is imputing a motive; and the less expected by him because at this moment he is actually suffering from his own communion for his kind feelings towards the Church of Rome.

Wiseman replied promising to suppress the words complained of in subsequent editions. But he on his side had something to complain of, in the way Newman had spoken of the 'authorised teaching' of the Church.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO DR. WISEMAN

Oriel, April 6, 1841.

My dear Lord,—I thank you for your Lordship's note just received and the kindness it expresses. It gives me very great sorrow to pain members of your communion in what I write; but is not this the state of Christendom, that we are all paining each other? If the terms I have used pain Roman Catholics, must not I be pained, though I am not so unreasonable as to complain of it, at their holding us to be heretics and schismatics, as they do? is it not painful to be told that our Sacraments have imparted no grace to us? that we are still in the flesh, that we worship Christ in His Sacraments but that He is not there? Yet, to hold this is part of their religious system—they cannot help it; it is one of the necessities of their position. And it is part of our religious system, and we cannot help it, to think that they admit doctrines and practices of an idolatrous character into their communion. Such a belief is an essential element in our religious profession; else why are we separate from so great a portion of the Catholic world?

have we placed ourselves in this miserable position for nothing?

I trust I never make accusations against Rome in the way of railing or insult. I have never meant to say, as you seem to think, that your Lordship's authoritative teaching is 'blasphemous.' I have not used the word except to disclaim the application of it by the English Church to the Mass. I have expressly said that the authoritative teaching was not such as to hinder other senses of the Decrees of Trent short of it, being 'now in point of fact held' in the Roman communion, as considering that what is objectionable in the teaching in great measure lies in its tone, the relative prominence of doctrines, and the practical impression conveyed. And after all the phrase 'authoritative teaching' is not mine,—but having it urged upon me by others, I say in my letter to Dr. Jelf, that in *my own* sense of it, which I explain, I can accept it. On the contrary I have quoted at the same time a passage from a work of mine in which I apply the word to the *formal* and *recognised* doctrine of the Church. I say, speaking of the Church of Rome, 'viewed in its formal principles and *authoritative* statements, it professes to be the champion of past times.'

And as to the charge of 'idolatrous usages,' I expressly say that I use the word in such a sense as not to interfere with their advocates belonging to that Church from which it is said that 'the idols shall be utterly abolished.' And without professing to be able to compare one error with another, I am ready to allow that we too have our idolatries, though of a different kind. Covetousness is called idolatry in Scripture, and I have hinted at other kinds of possible idolatry in a letter I have just written to the Bishop of Oxford.

I feel as much as any one the lamentable state of Christendom, and heartily wish that the communions of Rome and England could be one—but the best way of tending to this great end seems to me to be, in charity and meekness, to state our convictions, not to stifle them.

Your Lordship's faithful servant,

J. H. NEWMAN.

In Mr. Ward's 'Life of Cardinal Wiseman,' there is a letter to Mr. Phillipps in which Wiseman complains of 'a most distressing letter from Newman,' which had painfully dispirited him.<sup>1</sup> 'I had written him,' he says, 'a letter in consequence of one in the *Tablet* last week from Oxford, harsh against O'Connell, as I had some interesting particulars concerning O'Connell's conduct at the preliminary meeting of the Institute. On this point Newman's letter was satisfactory.' Wiseman's letter was preserved by Newman, and from it we learn that O'Connell 'brought two very beautifully worded and conciliatory resolutions, respecting the state of feeling at Oxford.' After a heated discussion which lasted three hours, O'Connell, 'rather than have a public difference of opinion upon so delicate a matter withdrew his resolutions.'

<sup>1</sup> Vol. i. p. 372.

## CHAPTER V

### THE JERUSALEM BISHOPRIC, 1841

'Alas! I cannot deny that the outward notes of the Church are partly gone from us, and partly going' (see *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, p. 335).

THE apparent termination of the affair of Tract 90 left Newman 'without any harass or anxiety' on his mind.<sup>1</sup> It was natural that he should feel an inward peace after the meekness with which he had borne the contumely with which he had been treated by the University, and the arduous act of obedience which he had rendered to his Bishop. Then the doubt which had assailed him in the autumn of 1839 seems to have been almost quiescent. Nevertheless he felt that retirement and self-effacement became him, and in consequence withdrew more and more to Littlemore, and occupied himself with his translations from St. Athanasius for the Library of the Fathers.

His security did not last long.

'I had,' he records in the 'Apologia,' 'determined to put aside all controversy, and I set myself down to my translation of St. Athanasius; but between July and November, I received three blows which broke me.

(1) 'I had got but a little way in my work when my trouble returned on me. The ghost had come a second time. In the "Arian History" I found the very same phenomenon, in a far bolder shape, which I had found in the Monophysite. . . . I saw clearly that in the history of Arianism, the pure Arians were the Protestants, the semi-Arians were the Anglicans, and that Rome now was what it

<sup>1</sup> *Apologia*, p. 139. He had been given to understand that his Letter to the Bishop of Oxford would, so far as the bishops were concerned, terminate the matter. But the 'understanding' was not respected.

was then. The truth lay, not with the "Via Media," but with what was called "the extreme party." . . .

(2) 'I was in the misery of this new unsettlement when . . . the bishops one after another began to charge against me. . . . They went on in this way, directing their charges against me, for three whole years. I recognised it as a condemnation; it was the only one that was in their power. At first I intended to protest; but I gave up the thought in despair. . . .

(3) 'As if all this were not enough, there came the affair of the Jerusalem Bishopric. . . . Now here at the very time that the Anglican Bishops were directing their censure upon me for avowing an approach to the Catholic Church not closer than I believed the Anglican formularies would allow, they were on the other hand fraternising, by their act or by their sufferance, with Protestant bodies. . . .'<sup>1</sup>

These were the three great blows, but there were other troubles besides, such as (1) the extremes into which the 'ultras' were rushing, (2) Keble's relations with his own Bishop, (3) the contest for the Poetry Professorship which was made a theological question. The obvious man for the post was Isaac Williams, but an opposition, which proved successful, was raised against him because he was a Tractarian.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Oriel: July 7, 1841.

My dear Keble,—I have just returned to Oxford from Cholderton and find your kind note. When there I saw the *British Critic* which I had not seen before. I asked T. M. [Thomas Mozley] at once how he came to speak about 'apoplectic' etc.—he declares he had no notion of Faussett's person whatever. He had seen him once in the pulpit ten years ago; this will relieve you, but I am afraid it cannot be given out, for no one but a friend will believe it.

The *B.C.* has been and is a matter of great anxiety to me. The difficulty is how to bring things home to T. M. without dispiriting him. I am quite sure that he writes in perfect simplicity and good humour, and that he thinks

<sup>1</sup> *Apologia*, pp. 139-142.

that article good humoured. I bargained to see all his articles in proof, but hearing that this was upon No. 90, I thought I was too near a party to see it with propriety, and some one at my elbow, whom I asked, agreed. My sister made T. M. put in some softening things and was very anxious, and there is on all hands a great wish to avoid excesses, if one saw the best way of doing it. I suppose T. M. would have no objection whatever himself not to write except upon given subjects such as you might name, if he can get others to write for him. I think that one such excess will not do harm, though a train of them would. I have some satisfaction that the long Vacation has commenced, it is like bed time at school, soothing and oblivious—people go and bathe in the sea, or drink waters, or travel, or rusticate, and annoyances are forgotten.

I ought in honesty to say that I had been so anxious about the Article in question, that when I saw it in print and had the explanation about 'apoplectic' I was agreeably relieved.

Ever yours affectly,  
JOHN H. NEWMAN.

Thomas Mozley had just taken over from Newman the editorship of the *British Critic*. Under his tolerant and genial auspices, this Review practically became the organ of the extreme men, such as Ward and Oakeley. His first number (July 1841) led off with a contribution for which Newman had declined to be responsible. This was Oakeley's famous article on Bishop Jewel, of which it is enough to say here that more than anything else it marked the parting of the ways between the old and new school of Tractarians. The editor's own contribution was a castigation of Dr. Faussett, the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, for a blatant piece of rhetoric which he had just shot off against Tract 90. It was a castigation having the supreme felicity of being very witty and richly deserved. The victim, of course, could not have liked it, and Pusey, Keble, and Newman felt that it transgressed the bounds of charity. But nearly every one else seems thoroughly to have enjoyed it. The passage which it was such a relief to

Newman to learn was not intended to be physically personal, is as follows :

' He [Dr. Faussett] confesses to a great difficulty in mere reading, not to speak of understanding what he reads. Two or three pages of quotation or argument he speaks of as a "long," "wearisome," "tedious," "perplexing," "irksome task"; "a prolixity well calculated to bewilder the reader and cause him to lose the thread of a disjointed argument"; "an entangled web of sophistical reasoning." So often do such expressions recur, that one is painfully reminded at every other page of headache, plethora, drowsiness, vertigo, depression of spirits, and other apoplectic symptoms. Knowing therefore the extreme difficulty some people find in mental operations, we are willing to suppose the delay before publication was no more than the Professor's constitution required. But for his own avowals on this point, we might have thought some explanation necessary.'

Dr. Faussett had discharged his piece just before the Long Vacation, thus making an effective reply difficult. He had done the same thing three years before; but on that occasion Newman got his reply through the press within twenty-four hours.<sup>1</sup>

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

July 20, 1841.

My dear Keble,—I am much concerned at your news about Young—I suppose this may be henceforth the case in some Dioceses, but I cannot understand its taking place on a large scale.

As to T. M. [Thomas Mozley] will you please say more at length what you think best. The Review is Rivington's; we cannot change about editors at our pleasure—nor can we force him to stop the Review. If we give it up, I suppose it will get into the hands of our opponents, but I assure you *I* have not the slightest personal wish to keep it in our hands. My only feeling would be that we were all rather hasty with T.M., but this is a thing which neither he (I am sure) nor I

<sup>1</sup> 'A Letter addressed to the Margaret Professor of Divinity.' Reprinted in *Via Media*, vol. ii.



shall trouble about. I think it might be a good thing certainly for Wilson to put *facts* before him—but I can fancy him, though defending himself to W. throwing up the Review thereupon—which may be a good thing, but W. should know what he is doing.

The question is whether it is not *more* possible to put T.M. under control than to *extinguish* the Review *itself*. But I assure you I have no opinion about it further than I say. Would you undertake a *general* control over it *privately*, which T.M. I am sure would gladly yield to you.

Ever yours affectly,

J. H. N.

P.S.—On second thoughts I hardly like *Wilson* writing to T.M. I suspect he would not write in the most *persuasive* manner; I do not speak at random.<sup>1</sup>

'The news about Young' was that Keble's curate, the Rev. Peter Young, had been refused Priest's Orders. When he presented himself for examination, a regular set was made at him by the Bishop and his chaplains. He was questioned about how he interpreted the Thirty-nine Articles, and about his views on the Real Presence, and finally sent back unordained. This incident had a great effect on the sensitive conscience of Keble. He began to ask himself if a clergyman whose views were antagonistic to those of his Bishop ought to hold preferment under him. The Bishop, as will appear later on, was somewhat taken aback by the possibility of such a result. It was one thing to bully a curate in deacon's orders, another to drive a man like Keble into resigning his living.

J. H. NEWMAN TO E. L. BADELEY, Esq.

Oriel College: July 28, 1841.

My dear Badeley,—I thank you very much for your friendly letter, sorry as I am for the cause of it. If I say very little in answer, impute this, first to the difficulty of conveying what I would say in a few words, and next to

<sup>1</sup> The Letter from Keble to which the above is an answer will be found in Miss Mozley's *Letters and Corr.* &c. ii. 313.

my hand being very tired with much writing. I trust things will turn out better than you anticipate, and that our credit will not be affected by one of those misfortunes to which all parties are liable.

Yours, My dear Badeley, very sincerely,  
J H. N.

The following letter *apparently* refers to Keble's letter on 'Catholic Subscription.'<sup>1</sup> In consequence, it would seem, of Newman's remarks, Keble omitted the note in which in the case of clear heresy, disobedience to a National Synod was contemplated, and struck out 'famous' before Cranmer's name.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Sept. 4, 1841.

My dear Keble,—As to an appeal you seem (Letter p. 29)<sup>2</sup> to allow of continuing in ministration in the supposed case of clear *heresy* in the Diocesan. And in your note you seem to contemplate the case (*viz.* in the same case) of disobeying a National Synod also. But is there not this difficult question, What is heresy? and again, considering in what deplorable ignorance the clergy, including the Bishops, are, of what Catholic doctrine is (for I suppose this is just the fact, though I do not mean to say *we* are not in some ignorance also) are you not hazarding all sorts of crude decisions, even if short of heresy, if you bring matters before an Episcopal Synod.

I can understand that a *Convocation* would be more *aggressive*, but I declare I think an Episcopal Synod would be quite as uncatholic, or rather more so. We should be better represented, there would be far more intelligence and power on our side in a Convocation than in an Episcopal Synod—yet do we not (rightly) deprecate a Convocation? Is not appealing to a Synod bringing matters to a fearful

<sup>1</sup> 'The case of Catholic Subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles considered: With especial Reference to the Duties and Difficulties of English Catholics in the Present Crisis: In a Letter to the Hon. Mr. Justice Coleridge, etc. London, 1841, Not Published.' Published by Dr. Pusey in 1866 together with Tract 90.

<sup>2</sup> P. 20 in Pusey's Edition.

issue? There are many men who only want as much as some Synodical *σφάλμα* to give up the English Church. I do not mean they *know* their position. Nay who can answer for himself what he would think of our Church with an heretical note upon it.<sup>1</sup> If the Church of Antioch or of Alexandria hath erred, at least it was in communion with other Churches, and orthodox persons might console themselves under an Arian Bishop that they also were part of the great Catholic body, but if our English Church makes itself heretical, we (individuals) actually are in communion with no part of the Catholic Church whatever. Is not an Independent in communion with the Church almost as truly as we should be? This is what *strikes* me. And then, as I said, What *is* heresy? is the Protestant doctrine of Justification? is the denial of the Real Presence? or the denial of Episcopal grace, or of the Catholic Church? I really fear that the majority of our Bishops at the moment would be on the Protestant side on all these points. But anyhow heresy must be defined for practice.

N.B.—Do you *advisedly* call Cranmer famous? I only mean lest people should say you were canonizing.

Ever your affectly,  
J. H. N.

Newman's difficulty in finding a definition of heresy which would include the doctrines of Protestantism arose from the fact that these doctrines had not, of course, been condemned by any General Council to which he as an Anglican could appeal. He had to meet the same difficulty a few weeks later when he wished to protest against the Jerusalem Bishopric.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Sept. 4, 1841.

My dear K.,—I have just received your parcel. As Pusey has returned, he shall read the letters before they go to your brother. I think you should say something (I have

<sup>1</sup> These were ominous words. Within a few weeks the Jerusalem bishopric scheme was to bring him face to face with this position.

not read your paper yet) on the difference between one's *own* bishop and another's, and a Bishop as a doctor and a governor, e.g. my word to the Bishop of Oxford 'a Bishop's lightest word is heavy' applies to my own Bishop not to the Bishop of Chester. . . . We have all been thinking of you and your trouble. One is glad that the Bishop is apparently drawing back, except that it is very hard upon Young.

Ever yours affectly,  
J. H. N.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Sept. 14, 1841.

My dear Keble,—I cannot help hoping that things are better with you than you anticipate. This story has come to Oxford: Ridley advised his father-in-law, the Bishop, not to send back Young's papers to you, 'for,' said he, 'when Keble sees how very mild his statements are he will give up his living.' The Bishop was much struck and astonished, and said, 'Then I shall not send them back.'

Again (*entre nous*) from what we hear, though of course we must expect heterogeneous proceedings, it is not at all certain that Sir Robert Peel will not be taking men *called* Puseyites, as thinking them more suited for certain places.

On the whole, as things have before now been at the worst as regards the clergy, so they now are as regards the Bishops, and they will improve I think. Recollect the clergy left off their wigs before the Bishops did. All in good time.<sup>1</sup>

I wish I could promise myself the pleasure of coming to see you when Archdeacon F[roude] does. But I do not know how. I am just getting Athanasius to press, which will be a very anxious matter—and, while one's thoughts get dissipated by leaving one's work, the printer will be sure to make it the excuse for indefinite irregularity. If there were a railroad between us I might come for a day—

<sup>1</sup> Up to this point the letter has already been published by Miss Mozley.

but it seems hard to lose two days on the road. If I did the thing, I should go up to town by the railroad and get down to you early next morning, and leave you in middle of next day so as to get to Oxford late at night the same day. In this way I should only be two days from Oxford, and more than one day of it with you.

As to the little Puseys, P. says they are better, but I do not know how to credit him. His mother<sup>1</sup> read me part of a letter from him, in which his sanguine tone was the worst part of it—as she seemed to feel. The facts were so serious. I mean the complaint seemed so deeply seated in Lucy and Philip. Mary is pretty well, e.g. he said that the medical men say that Philip will, they hope, be able to walk with a high shoe; though he cannot escape a stiff knee, and that they do not see why he should not recover his hearing—meanwhile P. alone can make him hear.

My sister,<sup>2</sup> who is easily overset, has been fidgetted with doing too much, and her eyes have failed her. The doctor says, I think truly, all she wants is change of air; but I am glad to say she is now much better, which I attribute to the R.'s coming. It is likely, among other things, that the *British Critic* has annoyed her.

Ever yours affectly,

J. H. N.

P.S.—The printer *promises* (pie crust) six sheets a week. You are to have one—Keble one, Marriott three, I two.

Newman records in his diary that on October 5 he received a letter from 'Walter.' One may fairly presume that this was Mr. Walter of the *Times*, and that his letter contained the news concerning the Jerusalem Bishopric which is referred to in the following letter to Keble. The *Times* at this period was friendly to the Tractarians and took a strong line against the Bishopric

<sup>1</sup> Lady Lucy Pusey. It was she who when Mrs. Pusey died 'with the true instinct of a mother, knew what would best help her son, and against his first wish, sent for Newman.' 'God,' wrote Pusey to Keble, 'has been very good to me. . . . He sent Newman to me (whom I saw at my mother's wish against my inclination) in the first hour of sorrow; and it was like the visit of an angel.' Pusey's *Life*, ii. 100, 101.

<sup>2</sup> Mrs. Thomas Mozley.

scheme. It may be worth recalling in this connection that during the preceding February, 'while Mr. Newman was correcting the proofs of No. 90, he was also writing to the *Times* the famous letters of *Catholicus*; a warning to eminent public men on the danger of declaiming on popular commonplaces without due examination of their worth.'<sup>1</sup>

These Letters were one of the earliest specimens Newman gave of his power as an unsparing hitter. They were provoked by an oration of Sir Robert Peel's on the occasion of the opening of a Reading Room at Tamworth in which he 'had spoken loosely, in the conventional and pompous way then fashionable of the all-sufficing and exclusive blessings of knowledge.'<sup>2</sup> Even Newman's friends did not know who *Catholicus* was. It is interesting to speculate what the feelings of the 'Four Tutors' and the 'Heads' would have been if the secret had come out; and whether they would have appreciated their luck. They owed something to the Catholic instinct of deference to authority. It had saved their backs from the stick with which the shoulders of good Sir Robert, and 'the arch sophist' Lord Brougham, had been belaboured.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

October 5, 1841.

Dear Keble,—I enclose what will be no consolation to you, but think you ought to see. It really does seem to me as if the Bishops were doing their best to uncatholicise us, and whether they will succeed before a rescue comes, who can say? The Bishop of Jerusalem is to be consecrated forthwith, perhaps in a few days. M. Bunsen is at the bottom of the whole business, who, I think I am right in saying considers the Nicene Council the first step in the corruption of the Church. . .

Newman's authority for this last statement, though he seems to have forgotten it, was a letter he received from T. D. Acland written at Bologna, May 11, 1834: 'Bunsen

<sup>1</sup> Church, *Oxford Movement*, p. 313.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* The Letters are reprinted under the title of 'The Tamworth Reading Room' in *Discussions and Arguments*.

took your book [‘The Arians’] with him; he was much struck with the beginning, and with the economy. I don't know whether you will succeed in shaking him in his strong Protestantism. He says the Council of Nice was the beginning of Popery, of adding an authority to Scripture, &c.<sup>1</sup>

Bunsen was for many years the Prussian Minister at Rome. He spoke English perfectly, and made the embassy a kind of social and intellectual centre much frequented by English visitors.<sup>2</sup> Newman made his acquaintance in 1833, when he was in Rome. He seems to have become fairly intimate with him. He writes to his sister: ‘We have encouraging accounts from M. Bunsen, who has received us very kindly. There is every reason for expecting that the Prussian communion will be applying to us for ordination in no long time.’<sup>3</sup>

Bunsen came to England in the summer of 1841 to negotiate the Jerusalem Bishopric. An enchanting man he must have been, for he captured Pusey in the course of a single interview. The bait apparently was the conversion of the Jews and the setting up in Jerusalem of a Church of the Circumcision. To this was joined a characteristically sanguine hope on Pusey's part that Prussian Protestants who placed themselves under the jurisdiction of the new Bishop ‘would be absorbed into our Church to which they had united themselves, and gradually imbibe her spirit and be Catholicised.’ It speaks much for Pusey's optimism that, in the midst of the outcry against Tract 90, he should have thought the then prevailing spirit of the Church of England so contagiously Catholic. As for the Jews, he somehow inferred from his conversation with Bunsen that there was a considerable number of them in Jerusalem already converted and only awaiting a Bishop to be formed

<sup>1</sup> When Bunsen had finished reading *The Arians* he delivered a most outspoken judgment. ‘M. Bunsen has pronounced upon our views, gathered from *The Arians* with singular vehemence. He says that, if we succeed, we shall be introducing Popery without authority, Protestantism without liberty, Catholicism without universality, and Evangelism without spirituality.’ Letter of Newman's to R. H. Froude (Mozley's *Letters and Corr.* ii. 128). One may take it for granted that if Bunsen later on became acquainted with the Parochial Sermons he must have reconsidered the last item of this wholesale condemnation.

<sup>2</sup> The dialogue ‘How to accomplish it’ (published in 1836, reprinted in *Discussions and Arguments*) opens on the staircase of the Prussian Embassy as if this was the most natural place in the world for two Englishmen to meet.

<sup>3</sup> *Letters and Corr.* i. 331; cf. *ibid.* ii. 59.

into a Church. Pusey's eyes, thanks to Mr. Hope and others, were soon opened to what he was letting himself in for, and he thoroughly agreed with Newman's Protest.<sup>1</sup> Another conquest of Bunsen's, and this not an ephemeral one, was Samuel Wilberforce, then Archdeacon of Surrey. He wrote on August 21 to his brother Robert :

'I have seen a great deal of Bunsen. What a noble fellow he is! He is now, it seems, bringing to completion a truly noble plan by which, I trust, on a back current, Episcopacy will flow into Prussia. It is at present an entire secret, but he has made me privy to his councils.'

And on October 30 he wrote to a lady :

'I have of late got *very* intimate with Bunsen. . . He showed me numbers of the King's private letters, and detailed to me his conversations. The King's intention is most pure. He quite wishes to gain over his people to true Episcopacy : he longs to give up the keys of the Church, but says, "No, thank you," to the Lutherans, who wish to take them from him, "because," he says, "God gave them me no doubt to keep till I could give them up to His Bishops, and then I will. . ." If time would serve I could tell you most interesting traits as to this Jewish Bishopric, and his right-minded simplicity of purpose,' &c.<sup>2</sup>

On October 7 Newman heard from Mr. Hope. He replied in a tone of excitement unusual with him.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

Your account of the Jerusalem matter is fearful—the more I think of it the more I am dismayed. On me it falls very hard—here I am labouring with all my might to keep men from Rome, and as if I had not enough trouble, a new element of separation is introduced. I feel so strongly

<sup>1</sup> See *Life of Pusey*, ii. vii. *passim*.

<sup>2</sup> *Life of Bishop Wilberforce*, i. 198 ff. This idea of Episcopacy on 'a back current,' i.e. the conferring of Holy Orders on men too indifferent to them even to decline them, was revolting to a layman like Mr. Hope. He called the whole scheme 'a Political Protectorate soldered together by a divine institution.'



about it that when I once begin to publish my 'Protest,'<sup>1</sup> I think I shall introduce it as a preface or appendix to every book and every edition of a book I print. If people are driving me quite against all my feelings out of the Church of England, they shall know that they are doing so. Is there no means of impeaching or indicting someone or other? Lawyers can throw anything into form. Should Bishop Alexander commit any irregularity out in Palestine might not one bring him into Court in England? I really can fancy our people giving an indirect sanction or connivance in the course of a few years to that dreadful scheme, which writers in the *Record* and elsewhere have put forth, of building the Jewish Temple for Jewish service.

My *reasons* for thinking of an action (prospectively) against the *Standard* or the like was this—that till I was cross-examined on my oath people would not believe I had not some understanding with the Pope.

Ever yours,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

In a pamphlet<sup>2</sup> which he published two months later Hope justified Newman's trust in lawyers. He showed that Dr. Alexander, as a Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland, could be called to account for any irregularities he might be guilty of out in Palestine. If he refused to 'submit to the Court or its sentence, and the Turkish Government should decline to give effect to an English decree, he might not the less really and publicly be cut off from and rejected by our Church.'<sup>3</sup> If this happened the Church of England would, of course, cease to be compromised by him, and he would lose the protection of the English Government.

<sup>1</sup> The 'Protest' can be read in Miss Mozley's *Letters and Corr.* ii. 324, or the *Apologia*, p. 145. It was sent to the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of Oxford on November 11.

<sup>2</sup> *The Bishopric of United Church of England and Ireland at Jerusalem considered in a Letter to a Friend*, by James R. Hope, B.C.L., &c. London, 1841.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.* pp. 54, 55. In a footnote he added: 'The Porte has lately deposed a Greek Patriarch at the request of our Government; surely it would not be less courteous in the case of an English Bishop.'

On October 10 Newman wrote as follows to his friend Samuel Wood :

J. H. NEWMAN TO S. F. WOOD, Esq.

I fear this weather has been against your taking much exercise. Pray do make yourself well. Why should you not remain in the country through the winter? . . . Have you heard of this deplorable Jerusalem matter? I do dread our Bishops will convert men to Rome, Dr. Wiseman sitting still. There is not a single Anglican at Jerusalem, but we are to place a Bishop (of the circumcision expressly) there, to collect a communion of Protestants, Jews, Druses, Monophysites, conforming under the influence of our war steamers, to counterbalance the Russian influence through Greeks, and the French through Latins. I have written it concisely, but, I assure you, not epigrammatically or with exaggeration, except that perhaps the Monophysites are to be *with* not *under* the Bishop.

Ever yours affectionately,  
J. H. N.

So far as concerned the English Government, the Jerusalem Bishopric was, as Newman in the letter just quoted described it, primarily a political move. France and Russia enjoyed great prestige in the East as the official protectors of the Catholic and the Greek or Orthodox communions respectively. The idea was to construct out of such stray Protestants as might be living in Palestine, converted Jews,<sup>1</sup> and any minor Oriental sects which might be ready to fall in with the arrangement, a third great communion to be under the protection of England and Prussia. The plan was, on the whole, well received by the religious world in England. Great things were prophesied of it, and subscriptions came in.<sup>2</sup> The fraternisation with

<sup>1</sup> Formby, who had lately been to Jerusalem, told Newman that there were no Anglicans and only about half a dozen converted Jews there.—Mozley, *Letters and Corr.* &c. ii. 316.

<sup>2</sup> The Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews promised £3000. The late Father William Neville used to tell a story of a fund started by some ladies towards the expense of 'the dear bishop's' morning tub. Material for this would have to be brought on the heads of water-carriers,

Prussian Lutherans and Calvinists gave a Protestant aspect to the scheme which delighted the Evangelicals. But perhaps what pleased them most was the prospect opened out of a great work among the Jews, whose return to Palestine and conversion, their favourite study of Prophecy led them eagerly to anticipate. Liberal Churchmen were naturally pleased with the sinking of theological differences which a coalition of sects necessarily implies. High Churchmen such as Hook, Perceval, and Palmer of Worcester, the very men who had braved *evil report* in their defence of Tract 90, were pleased with the assertion of the principle of Episcopacy which the scheme involved. They were led to hope that it would prepare the way for the Prussian Church becoming episcopal.

The following letter to Keble is one among many which show how distressed Newman was by the Bishops' charges and the Jerusalem scheme.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

October 24, 1841.

Dear Keble,— . . . I expect it was something which Pusey scribbled in a note to Jelf, and Jelf sent bodily to the Bishop of London, which is the light thing. (Perhaps it was a letter of mine to Mill. It was not light.) The truth is they cannot bear the *plain truth* to be spoken to them. I am too anxious for others, nay for myself, to say anything light about going to Rome. Our Church seems fast protestantising itself, and this I think it right to say everywhere—not using the word protestant—but not lightly. Have you seen the Bishop of Chester's Charge? He seems to me, as far as in him lies, to have cut off Chester by it, from the Catholic Church. In such cases I only see the alternative of obeying or of calling the Bishop heretic. St. Ignatius' words about trifling with the Bishop invisible

a picturesque Oriental detail which appealed to the imagination. The Bishop, who was a converted Jew, was evidently supposed to be as thoroughly Anglicised as he was Christianised. But very likely the story, together with a flippant commentary which was part of it, merely records the irreverence of some of the younger Tractarians.

are so strong,<sup>1</sup> I really see no alternative between denying that he is in possession of his functions and obeying him. But perhaps, after my saying all this, you will be relieved at seeing the Charge, and think more mildly of it.

As to the Jerusalem matter the simple case is this—our government wants a resident religious influence there, such as the Greek Church is to Russia and the Latin to France, and its power is so great that they say a Bishop would be at the head of a large communion in no time, though we have no members of our Church there at present. So we join with Protestant Prussia to found a sect, and put a Bishop over it. Really if one has any right to utter such a thing, considering Jerusalem is the spot, there is something almost awful in this.

Ever yours affectly,  
J. H. N.

P.S.—I am full of dismay lest a secession to the Church of Rome is in prospect (years hence perhaps) on the part of men who are least suspected.

A. B. [the name is not legible] is going out to Malta to show Greeks and Latins what an English Bishop's wife can be like.

On November 1 Newman wrote as follows to Mr. Walter of the *Times* :

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO MR. WALTER

Oriel College.

My dear Walter,—I was most obliged by your attending to my hint about the Palestine Bishop, and hope, indeed I *know*, that the articles have done good service.

What would you say to putting the accompanying letter into the columns of the *Times*? I know it is fierce—or what people call bitter—but the Paper, if you thought necessary, might disown it. I assure you such acts on the

<sup>1</sup> 'It is meet that ye should be obedient without dissimulation. For a man doth not so much deceive this bishop who is seen, as cheat the other who is invisible.'

part of our authorities are doing *great* harm—are unsettling persons' minds. Do you hear that Sibthorpe has conformed to Rome? this is quite a secret as yet, but will probably be known in a few days. The subject you suggest is a very favourite one of Rogers', and he caught at it. I think he will try to send you some papers on it. It seems to me a very important one, but just at this time I am too full of Athanasius.

Yours very truly,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

The Letter to the *Times* which accompanied this note was not published. The following is apparently the rough draft of it.

Sir,—The appointment of a Bishop to Palestine on the part of the English Church is too grave a matter to be passed over in silence by those, who while they are opposed to it, do not take the ground against it which has been so ably supported in your columns.

I beg your permission to state the circumstances of the case. A few of our Bishops, acting for the whole, without bringing the matter formally before the Episcopal College, but at most only happening to mention it to several of their brethren, perhaps one by one, at the late meeting of Convocation, (which was attended by but seven Bishops in all) and keeping close their intentions even from parties of high consideration staying at their palaces, and from their ordinary advisers, resolve on committing, or have committed our Church to a measure of a very novel character, momentous in point of precedent, and involving consequences which no one can at present foresee.

They are for consecrating a Bishop for a country where at present there are no resident members of our Church. At Malta they are providing a Bishop for a flock which has none; but in Palestine there is no flock. They send the Bishop to make a flock. They treat the country as heathen.

Last Easter, I believe, there were thirty-five members of our Church at Jerusalem. They were travellers; call

them residents; call all the British officials Anglicans. Suppose these are a round fifty; is this a number for a Bishop?

Wesleyan Methodists indeed there are in 'Syria.' Are we sending a Bishop to them?

But it is urged that there are converted Anglican Jews there, for whom a Bishop is needed. How many? I am credibly informed that there are not half-a-dozen.

Moreover by the late Act under which the consecration will take place, the Bishop may exercise within his limits 'spiritual jurisdiction over the ministers of British congregations of the United Church of England and Ireland, and over *such other Protestant Congregations* as may be desirous of placing themselves under his authority.' Now it is probable that all Protestants will be glad to avail themselves of this invitation, in consideration of the great temporal advantages which will attend it. All Christians, but Greeks and Latins, are in a state of persecution in the East. They are not recognised, they belong to no Power. Russia supports the Greeks, and France the Latins; but the Protestants are almost like the Jews of the Middle Ages. Very desirable is it that they should have a Protector; generous it may be in Great Britain to become that protector; and joyfully will these parties hail the protection. But what has this to do with the English Church? Why must the successors of Augustine and Anselm become superintendents of a mixed multitude of Protestants, and, what is more likely, of men of no Profession whatever? What, for instance, is to hinder a congregation of Rationalists or Socinians putting themselves under the 'spiritual jurisdiction' of the Anglican Bishop? and how is he to manage to dispossess them of their Socinianism? What has a Bishop to do with the matter at all? Why not make a consul instead? *Sancta sanctis*. Why profane religion to political purposes? Why send out a Boy Bishop or an Abbot of Unreason, or Pope of fools, or Monk of Misrule, to mock the Greek and Latin functionaries, and to disgrace, defile, uncatholicize ourselves? I mean no offence whatever to the individual himself on

which the choice of our acting authorities is said to have fallen. The more respectable the person raised to that bad eminence, the more anti-Christian is the exhibition. He is said to be well versed in rabbinical learning ; this will not teach him the difference between Catholic and Protestant.

Nor is this all. I see it is now professed that an understanding is to exist between our Bishop and the Greek orthodox body. This was an afterthought. The main object was, and I believe is, to negotiate with the heretical Monophysites especially of Mesopotamia. Mesopotamia is the way to the Euphrates ; the Euphrates is the way to India. It is desirable to consolidate our Empire. What is the Church worth if she is to be nice and mealy-mouthed when a piece of work is to be done for her good lord the State. Surely, surely, in *such* a case, some formula can be found for proving heresy to be orthodoxy and schism to be charity.

Our mouths, however, are stopped by a confidential whisper that this is to be the means of introducing Episcopacy into Prussia. What is the worth of Episcopacy without orthodoxy ? What is it but a husk pretending to be what it is not ? Do the Prussians take the orthodox view of the Sacraments ? What respect is due to a Bishop who denies the grace of Baptism ? Surely it is an evil great enough to find Bishops heretics, without going on to make heretics Bishops.

Is all this the way to keep certain of our members from Rome ? or is it on the whole desirable that they should go, and a good riddance ?

ΙΔΙΩΤΗΣ.

The following lengthy letter was written by Newman to his sister, Mrs. J. Mozley, on a Sunday, on which day he probably left his 'St. Athanasius' alone. It is a document of particular interest both on account of the careful survey it gives of the general situation, and the state of men's minds ; and also because of the personal information contained in it. The ten to twelve hours a day at 'St. Athanasius,' in the midst of all his poignant anxieties, is a

fine testimony to Newman's discipline of mind and strength of will, especially when one remembers that his work so far from being a distraction increased his troubles by reviving in an intenser form the doubts which had assailed him in 1839. In spite of all these drawbacks he achieved a work which 'must always be ranked among the richest treasures of English Patristic literature.'<sup>1</sup> The two volumes, 'Select Treatises of St. Athanasius in controversy with the Arians, translated with Notes and Indices,' were published in the 'Library of the Fathers' during 1843 and 1844. Soon afterwards Newman set to work at his 'Essay on Development.' A scholarly work like the 'St. Athanasius,' and a literary and philosophical landmark like the *Development* would have been plenty to show for four years of unbroken leisure and peace. Like many other people Newman seems to have done his best work under heavy pressure.

To return to the letter to his sister. Five days previously Newman had written another letter<sup>2</sup> to her, telling her not to credit newspaper reports of secessions to Rome. 'Do not,' he continues, 'believe it. Not one will go. At the same time I cannot answer for *years hence*, if the present state of things is persevered in.' In the following letter he says, 'It is impossible to answer for what may happen any day.' Something must have taken place during the interval between the two letters to make him more despondent.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO MRS. J. MOZLEY

Oriel: Nov. 21, 1841.

My dear Jemima,—I am at present so overpowered with work that I have in vain wished to write to you for a long while past. For the last six or eight weeks I have been at the Athanasius for ten to twelve hours every day, merely in getting it through the press, and we have achieved in that time something like six sheets. The work will not *show* at all; I had translated it in the early part of the

<sup>1</sup> Dr. Bright in *Dict. of Christ. Biog.*—'The most important work published since Bull,' the editors of the *Oxford Library of the Fathers* called it, long after Newman had left them. Compare also Liddon, *Life of Pusey*, i. 436.

<sup>2</sup> Printed in Miss Mozley's *Letters and Corr.* ii. 325.



Long Vacation. My health, thank God, does not suffer a bit, and if I [it ?] did, I should stop. And I will add for Harriet's sake, who has kindly inquired (for I wish you to send this to T. and H. under strict secrecy—as to Derby I do not know what to say—it is unnatural John should not see—and Mrs. Mozley and Anne M. are so kind that I do not like secrets with them, but I do not know how to draw the line) that my sleep is better than it ever has been. It has been gradually improving for years, if it is right to boast—and now I sleep sound and am refreshed even though I go late to bed. I so dread want of sleep, that I should be on my guard against any symptoms of its approach. And perhaps it is well that I should be very busy, for though I am not apt to be downcast about prospects, having never been sanguine, and do not realise so vividly as to pain me the difficulties which are on every side, yet certainly there is enough to make me anxious, if anxious I am ever to be. Yet I am not.

Our present great anxiety is the matter of Williams' election to the Poetry Professorship. I have been against his standing throughout, for a great dread of Convocation—but considering *I* am the cause of the opposition by Tract 90, it would have been ungenerous to press my objection, and I cannot complain of the difficulty though I foresaw it. I have a dread of Convocation exceedingly great—but now we hear that, if our opponents succeeded in this contest, which I fear they will, there is already a plan to proceed to measures which are to have the effect of 'driving us clean out of the University.' I suppose this means, when put soberly, something like a test about the sense in which the Articles are subscribed, which need not be retrospective. Now the effect of W.'s failure will be bad enough in itself; and I am sorry to say, I fear some friends of mine, though they do not say so, would not be sorry for it. They feel the misery of the present state of the Church, without half the notes of the Church Catholic upon her—they look out for signs of God's providence one way or the other; and since they despair of the Church actually righting,

they look with some sort of relief, as the second best count, for signs of her retrograding and withdrawing her notes. And though the mere defeat of a person in a University Election is a little thing enough, yet if there is a movement of the Church as a whole in all its ranks to disown Catholic truth, in its Bishops, Societies, popular organs and the like, the fact of a series of disavowals on the part of the University is an important fact as part of a series or collection. And it cannot be denied, I suppose, that a series of such facts might happen amounting to a moral evidence that our Church was quite severed and distinct from the Church of the first ages.

At first sight it does not appear that such a conclusion, however plausible, would at once lead persons to Rome—but it would, even in the way of *reason*. For they would say, since the Church must be somewhere and is not in England, it must be in the communion of Rome—and on the strength of this inference they would submit *in faith* to what they did not like in the Roman system. I say in the way of *reason*, for to this must be added the undeniable agreement of these persons in devotional spirit and practical view of things to what is *inculcated* (I do not say fulfilled) in the Roman Church, and again, the support, whatever it is, which Rome has in Antiquity. And there is a notion springing up that we should improve Rome by joining it, whereas we have protested for three centuries and effected nothing.

I need hardly say that I steadily opposed whatever acts of intercourse have taken place between anyone here (they have been *very* slight and few) and the Roman Catholics. I should like very much to make *them* better only it is to my mind like running into temptation. But when men find *sympathy* there and *none* at home, and when they find in [their Church] private amiable and devout men whom the world does not hear of, it is a difficulty altogether to prevent it.

Things being in this state, and in a place like this, Catholic opinions being ever in course of communication from one person to another, it is impossible to answer for what may happen any day. At present the men who are most in

danger here and elsewhere declare they will do nothing which I do not approve, and they do really try on the whole to act upon this resolve.

And here by the bye I do not account it any mistake to have said that Catholic opinions will strengthen the Church against Rome, when appearances are now *vice versa*. Those opinions are a powerful weapon—they have not come into the world for nothing. They must tell either for us or against us. If we will not use them others will. If a physician promises to cure a patient, it is on condition of his taking his medicine, not if he chucks it out of window. We have not, for eight years been encouraged by any one dignitary of the Church, I think I may say. What can you expect?

If testimonials are refused, or if any measure passes Convocation, such as I have hinted at, only consider the consequence! You cannot destroy opinions—if our church does not admit [them] men will look out for a Church that does—not to insist on this very grave question, whether the denial of certain opinions does not involve a denial that we are a branch of the Church.

Now what has been said is miserable enough—but as if it were not enough, a new difficulty, and most unexpected, has happened in this matter of the Jerusalem Bishoprick. The Church is actually *changing* her position, by forming a special league which she has never done before with foreign Protestants. I have reason to think that whether on the part of Bunsen or another, still a plan there is for organizing a large Protestant league throughout the world, and in order to this it is desired, or it will be involved, to put the Church of England on a more Protestant footing than it has hitherto acknowledged. The present measure has been done *without* advice of the body of Bishops—my own Bishop's letter in answer to my Protest is not only most kind in itself but most satisfactory on this point—he knows nothing at all about the matter except through the newspapers. Indeed it is as yet but an inchoate act, and I trust it will never be completed—but if it be, it will be the most fearful event for the Church of England since

her separation from Rome. It is a formal recognition of the Protestants by communicating with them in a Church, without reconciliation on their part. In addition we are sending out a Bishop there who they boast is of 'the pure blood of Judah,' and his wife of 'the pure blood of Levi'—as if this was not the very error of the Galatians, as if the Jewish Law had [not] been abolished once for all. Dr. Mill's great fear was our projected union with the Monophysites, for one aspect of evil does not do justice to the measure—but now the *Standard* of a day or two since openly advocates our union with the Nestorians. I fear I must say that, *if* we go into communion with the Nestorians, our own communion will not be safe to remain in—but I do not believe we shall—and in order to do my part towards preventing it, I have sent the Protest you have heard me speak of to the Bishop of Oxford. Magdalen Palmer is sending out a Protest too—it will be criticized in point of style and manner, because they are his own—but it is most powerful and comes from his heart. It will be called mad, so will mine—but never mind if it does its work—if it does not, why then I can only wish it did. I had intended to publish it at once—but the kind way in which my Bishop takes it, makes me suspend my purpose. I enclose a copy, which send to T. and H. *from them it must* come back to me.

Now I have not mentioned what is doing as much harm as anything, the Episcopal charges. At this very moment the Bishop of Winchester's is the most pernicious, for he does not publish but *delays*—now Keble's resignation *depends* upon this charge—the consequence is that people are kept in a continual suspense, and no one knows what is to happen. You may fancy how young men are unsettled in consequence—till at length questions like these are breaking out, 'Would you go to Rome if K. and N. did?' While others *say* that they *will* go if I go.

But now I have said more than enough—and so with kind love of my Aunt, and hoping A. M. has got well

I am, my dear J. Ever yours affectly,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

On November 24, Newman wrote a long letter to Mr. Hope, from which the following extract may be given.<sup>1</sup>

‘ Nor do I see that any one should be surprised at my resolving on such a course. I have been for a long while assuring persons that the English Church was a branch of the Catholic Church. If, then a measure is in progress which in my judgment tends to cut from under me the very ground on which I have been writing and talking, and to prove all I hold a mere theory and illusion—a paper theology which facts contradict—who will not excuse it if I am deeply pained at such proceedings? When friends who rely on my word come to me and say, “ You *told* us the English Church was *Catholic*,” what am I to say to this reproach? ’

On this same day, November 24, Mr. Hope was writing a long letter to Mr. Gladstone on the same topic. It is a letter which should be carefully read by all who are interested in the history of the time to which it belongs, though it is only possible to give here a couple of short extracts.<sup>2</sup>

‘ The “ common sense ” or general tenor of questions is what alone the majority of men are guided by. . . . Look at the present state of Christendom, and you will see three great divisions—Catholicity, Protestantism, and Rationalism . . . the third existing amongst both the others, but chiefly in the second class, and by many thought to be a necessary development, or even privilege implied in its fundamental principles. Poised between the first two has hitherto stood the Church of England. . . . At a moment like this, when to take a step which upon its general surface implies Protestantism, and which can be secured in its Catholicity only by theological distinctions, which (if tenable) are tenable only against theologians and upon arguments, is in the “ common sense ” of the day to determine the question at issue. Who will believe that distinctions which to your mind are so strong had

<sup>1</sup> The whole letter can be read in *Memoirs of J. R. Hope-Scott*. The latter half was also printed in Miss Mozley's *Letters and Corr.* ii. 328 ff.

<sup>2</sup> The whole letter will be found in *Memoirs of J. R. Hope-Scott*, i. 323 ff.

any weight with the hasty generalisers from whom this plan has emanated? Who will be disposed to pause and weigh the particulars of communion when he sees that the parties engaged in establishing it hardly took time even to ascertain its general possibility and expedience? Who can think that the Bishops of our church who have swallowed the Augsburg confession, and dispensed with the Liturgy have attached any saving sense to the one particular of Orders—which was in fact a proposal on the Prussian side rather than a condition on ours?’

And again :

‘ Had Prussia come to us humbled and penitent, complaining that separation from the Catholic Church was too heavy any longer to be borne . . . then none more gladly than I would have prayed that, as far as higher duties would allow, she should become one with us. But, as it is, she comes jauntily, by a Royal Envoy, with a Royal Liturgy in her hand, and a new and comprehensive theory of religion on her lips, to propose joint endowment of Bishoprics, alternate nominations, mixed confessions of faith . . . and a Political Protectorate soldered together by a divine institution. . . . And, alas that it should be so, she has found amongst our Bishops men ready to grant, without a pause or a doubt, all that she desired.’

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

November 26, 1841.

My dear Hope,—If you knew how busy I am with Athanasius (I have been at it from ten to twelve hours every day these six or eight weeks) you would pardon, what needs it, my sending you Mr. Formby’s letter and making the mistake about Stapleton. I have written something on the general subject of your letters, and now to answer your details.

You have seen I suppose *the Prussian State Announcement* of the arrangement, which has been in the Papers.

As to Publishing my Protest, I shall leave that in the hands of others.

You may show my Protest to whom you like.

We are doing well in the Professorship *absolutely*—but I fear not relatively. At least I hear of a great force coming up against us. I think the Wadham story is this—Mr. Allies, the Bishop of London's Chaplain (?) wrote to Trinity to give his vote to W. *because* the Wadham people who canvassed him had mentioned ulterior measures. *But I have no right to state reasons*; so you must not repeat it thus formally.

I fear few Colleges would have so united a set of fellows as to refuse the College seal to testimonials. It would seem to be spiting other men also. For myself, my battles have been passed *many* years.

Supposing the *Standard* cannot prove its point about the ten men, yet mentioned names, might we not have an action against it? I suspect by its manner it is afraid of one. This would be good fun. At first sight I do not dislike the idea.

Ever yrs,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO S. F. WOOD, Esq.

Oriel College : December 6, 1841.

My dear Wood,—It seems unkind in me to have kept silence so long—but I am very busy. Oakeley told you what I thought generally—for he came to me with a message from you. I do not at all like *forcing* the mind—and I recommended that you should join in such services as were pleasant to you. He seemed to think that they would not wish to adopt any in which you would not wish to join, and I have not heard from him since he left the place.

There is one thing very much needed as a law question—but I am not sure whether it comes in your range, or would be enough of a subject, to know the legal process &c., &c., for conducting an impeachment of heresy, e.g. against a

dignitary. We are in so bad a way, that there seems no medium between taking very strong measures in time to come—or acknowledging we are not a Church. I wish there were some possible way of interfering in this Jerusalem matter. Is there no shape in which it could be thrown at present, or prospectively, in which the Presbytery could interfere? Supposing the Bishop of Jerusalem, being a Bishop of the United Church of England and Ireland, were to communicate with a heretic, could one impeach him? &c.

As to my deed, I must have a talk with you before I do anything. I am in no hurry—and circumstances are so unsettled just now, that I hardly know what to settle myself.

I hope to have better and better accounts of your health.

I wish we were out of our present most distressing struggle here—but I don't see how it is to be effected. We have a very fair chance of success—on the other hand retirement is defeat with nothing to show for it.

Ever yrs. affectionately

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—As to Bowyer, at any moment I could send up a letter—but he is rather acquainted with foreign, i.e. Canon Law, than English.

J. H. NEWMAN TO S. F. WOOD, Esq.

Oriel: December 13, 1841.

My dear Wood,—An account of a Sermon of mine has come round to me thro' Oakeley, you and R. Wilberforce, so very different from the fact that I write to you about it—especially as the last mentioned speaks to me of you. He would not like it mentioned, but in short he thinks I am turning R.C.—It makes one melancholy when friends are in so sensitive a state as he must be. What have you said to him to make him think so?

My dear W. in many ways I am anxious about you. I think that you are in a state of health, such, that it is



*wrong* to burden yourself with many thoughts. I have intended for some time past to talk to you on this subject. As fulness of bread incapacitates one from sacred thoughts, so I conceive great weakness of body may make it a duty to intermit penitential ones. I give it as my clear judgment, and earnestly, from my love for you, that you are *likely* to be doing yourself harm. More than 'likely' I cannot say without seeing more of you.

R. W. makes me think that your mind is also getting unsettled on the subject of Rome. I think you will give me credit, Carissime, of not undervaluing the strength of the feelings which draw one that way—and yet I am (I trust) quite clear about my duty to remain where I am. Indeed much clearer than I was some time since. If it is not presumptuous to say, I trust I have been favoured with a much more definite view of the (promised) inward evidence of the Presence of Christ with us in the Sacraments, now that the outward notes of it are being removed. And I am content to be with Moses in the desert—or with Elijah excommunicated from the Temple. I say this, putting things at the strongest. But post time is come. Excuse an abrupt letter.

Ever yr. affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

Oriel College : December 23<sup>rd</sup>/41.

My dear Hope,—I guess the principal balance on my Book account is the trouble you have had about it. When you look into it, if really there is as much as £5 due to me, please to give it without my name to the Scotch College—if it is under £5 please to pay it to Stewart, and I will take out some books to the worth of it from him.

You take the Canons of 1603 as *legal authority*, I see. This has been a bone in my throat. I *wish* them to show the *animus* of our Church, but directly you make them authority, the unhappy Ward is *ipso facto* excommunicate

for having been to Oscott, until he repent of his wicked error. But there is no resisting law.

Palmer's 'Aids to Reflection' contain some very valuable documents.

What the Bishops are doing is most serious, as well as unjustifiable, as I think. Really one does not know but they may meet in council and bring out some tests which will have the effect forthwith of precipitating us, and leaving the Church clean Protestant. Pray, does a *majority* bind in such a council? I mean in the way of canons. Can a majority determine the doctrine of the Church? If so, we had need look out for cheap lodgings. Where am I to stow all my books?

I think Gladstone will have a hard matter to put an end to this contest.

I am amused at old Mr. Hallam. He used to patronize me for some time, and express a wish to see me—when he thought it all moonshine—as a curious literary absurdity. There is the Bishop of Calcutta too, who says, 'If indeed they had given a hint as to some neglected point of *ecclesiastical discipline*, their voice, as coming from learned divines in the seclusion of a *University*, would have been gratefully listened to.' But it is intolerable that fellows of College, who are notoriously out of the world, anything but men of the world, should presume to interfere with us who have been men of the world, practical men, hard-working pastors and eloquent preachers, all our days. I have taken up enough of your time with this talk. I shall rejoice to see your pamphlet.

Ever yrs,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. W. DODSWORTH

Oriel College: The Feast of St. John, 1841.

My dear Mr. Dodsworth,—I thank you much for your Sermon. Nothing will save us but such protests as your note in it contains. I believe a very general mis-giving is beginning to show itself about our Church's

Catholicity—and that on the ground of those most painful things which some of the Bishops are saying and doing. Of *course* preaching the doctrine of the Holy Catholic Church will lead men to Rome, *supposing* our Bishops declare we are *not* part of the Catholic Church, or that we do not hold the Catholic doctrines. I have no confidence that the worst results will not take place, because I have no confidence that the worst of measures or avowals may not issue from authority. This is the beginning and the end of the matter. The Church doctrines were not sent into the world for nothing—if we will not use them, other communions will.

With these feelings you may think how much I rejoiced to see you had spoken so plainly about the Bishop of Chester's charge. The Jerusalem matter, however, is what quite unnerves me. It is so wanton an innovation. But I trust that Hope's pamphlet shows that we may weather the danger.

I am sure that they are the worst friends of the Church who refuse to look dangers in the face. Her best friends are those who, instead of shutting their eyes, tell us when she is in danger. For centuries she has been wasting away, because persons have made the best of things and palliated serious faults. Of course directly one speaks out, one is accused of intending to Romanise—but I would speak out to *prevent* what silence would not tend a whit to prevent, but to excuse.

As it is, I fear irremediable evil is done by the acts I allude to. Confidence is shaken—and when once a *doubt* of our Catholicity gets into the mind, it is like a seed—it lies for years to appearance dead—but alas, it has its hour of germinating or is ever threatening.

It should ever be borne in mind that no serious movement towards Rome took place, in fact, till the year 1841, when the authorities of the Church had more or less declared themselves against Catholic truth.

I have written to you very freely, but, I hope, not so that you can misunderstand my meaning.

Yours very truly,

JOH. H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. W. DODSWORTH

Oriel : October 10, 1841.

My dear Mr. Dodsworth,—I promised Parker here the Tract translation of Bishop Andrewes' Devotions for one of his little books—and he is going to put it to press at once. He had been waiting for the translation of the second part, but I fear it is not likely to be ready soon. I am sorry to have delayed my answer, but he was out of Oxford when your note came.

Believe me,

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—(1) Will you kindly express to Mr. Burns my regret—and that else I should most readily have given him the Tract.

(2) What do you say to this hideous business of the Jerusalem Bishoprick? Dr. Wiseman may sit still—Our Bishops will do his work.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

December 2, 1841.

My dear H.,—I have not yet had time to read carefully your letter, but lest you should think I am turning Roman outright, I send you last Sunday's sermon—which let me have back (unread or read) at once—as people want it.<sup>1</sup>

I fully think that *if* this particular measure comes off, it will all but unchurch us. I cannot help *facts*—it is not my doing, it is an external fact. And if it takes place, I think it clear that, though one might remain where one was, oneself—yet we should have *no arguments* to prevent others going to Rome.

I am amused at your horror<sup>7</sup> of our ultras—some of them are the very persons you would like, if you knew them.

Ever your affectly,

J. H. N.

<sup>1</sup> Apparently Sermon 21, *Subjects of the Day*.

## CHAPTER VI

### INCREASING DIFFICULTIES, 1842

*Foris pugnae : intus timores.*

THE 'Apologia' is divided into five chapters. The headings of the first four are :

- History of my Religious Opinions up to 1833.
- History of my Religious Opinions from 1833 to 1839.
- History of my Religious Opinions from 1839 to 1841.
- History of my Religious Opinions from 1841 to 1845.

The fifth chapter, which describes a fixed state, is entitled 'Position of My Mind after 1845.'

The first four chapters correspond with four markedly distinct stages in the history of the author's Anglican career. During the first, at least from the time when he came to Oxford, the ideas which inspired the Movement of 1833 were being planted and were ripening in his mind. During the second they are in full vigour. During the third they are decaying. In the fourth they are practically dead. Not as a piece of cheap rhetoric, but as a serviceable peg for the memory, one might liken these four stages to the four seasons of the year.

The end of 1841 brings us to the final stage. This must be subdivided into two equal periods. The first is from the autumn of 1841 to the autumn of 1843, when Newman resigned St. Mary's and preached his last Anglican sermon, 'The Parting of Friends.' The second ends in the autumn of 1845 when he was received into the Catholic Church, and appended to his unfinished 'Essay on Development' the celebrated passage beginning, 'Such were the thoughts concerning the "Blessed Vision of Peace," of one whose long-continued petition had been that the

most merciful would not despise the work of His own Hands,' &c.

In the beginning of the fourth chapter of the 'Apologia,' Newman sums up his 'position in the view of duty,' from the autumn of 1841 to the autumn of 1843 under nine headings :

'(1) I had given up my place in the Movement in my letter to the Bishop of Oxford in the spring of 1841; but (2) I could not give up my duties towards the many and various minds who had more or less been brought into it by me; (3) I expected or intended gradually to face back into Lay Communion; (4) I never contemplated leaving the Church of England; (5) I could not hold office in its service, if I were not allowed to hold the Catholic sense of the Articles; (6) I could not go to Rome, while she suffered honours to be paid to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints which I thought in my conscience to be incompatible with the Supreme, Incommunicable Glory of the One Infinite and Eternal; (7) I desired union with Rome under conditions, Church with Church; (8) I called Littlemore my Torres Vedras, and thought that some day we might advance within the Anglican Church as we had been forced to retire; (9) I kept back all persons who were disposed to go to Rome with all my might.'

Some remarks may be offered on the third, fourth, and sixth of these heads.

He did not retire into Lay Communion to the extent of putting off the clerical garb. One can be quite certain that he never even contemplated such a step till he was within a few weeks of becoming a Catholic. But after he had resigned St. Mary's he held no clerical preferment, and never preached again.

He 'never contemplated leaving the Church of England'; on the contrary, as his letters show, he fought against the suggestions and premonitions which kept rising up in his mind that the claims of Rome might prove irresistible. He did not give a *voluntary* assent to these thoughts. He made up his mind that they might be temptations, and that till their character was manifest he ought to treat them as such; giving himself up in the meanwhile more and more to prayer and self-discipline. It might safely be said that up till about the

middle of 1843 he hardly recognised how things really were with him.<sup>1</sup>

To turn now to the sixth and most important of these headings. In his Letter to Dr. Jelf, Newman had said:

'As to the present authoritative teaching of the Church of Rome, to judge by what we see in public, I think it goes very far indeed to substitute another Gospel for the true one. Instead of setting before the soul the Holy Trinity, and hell and heaven; it does seem to me as a popular system, to preach the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, and Purgatory. If ever there was a system which required reformation, it is that of Rome at this day,'<sup>2</sup> &c.

'It does seem to me as a popular system,' &c. It is worth noting that, at the time under consideration, Newman's difficulty was a practical, not a theoretical one. The lawfulness or unlawfulness of invocations addressed directly to the Saints was, in his eyes, an open question, and not one upon which the individual Christian ought to take the responsibility of deciding. In consequence so long as he was an Anglican he did not even in private use such invocations, and dissuaded others from using them. It was perilous to use them without the sanction of authority; and this they certainly had not in the English Church. But he did not stop here. He was convinced that the cult of the Saints, as practised in the Catholic Church, did come perilously near to superseding the worship of God.

If he had approached the subject from the historical point of view and argued that modern devotions to the Saints cannot be justified by the appeal to Antiquity, he would have been speaking as an expert, and, though experts are far from infallible, those who disagreed with him could not have questioned his right to his own opinion. But he was too careful, too well informed to take upon himself to pronounce that these devotions might not, in theory at least, be defended as legitimate developments of principles

<sup>1</sup> In his letter to Keble on May 4 (p. 217) he speaks of 'something which has at last been forced upon my full consciousness,' 'something about myself which is no longer a secret to me,' &c.

<sup>2</sup> *Via Media*, ii. 368-9. In the *Apologia* he omits to mention Purgatory. This may have been for the sake of brevity; but it is more likely that on this point his feelings were nothing like so keen as they were in regard to the cult of the Saints.

furnished by Antiquity. His cautiousness, however, forsook him when he gave judgment in his heart<sup>1</sup> upon a practical matter concerning a system with which he had no practical acquaintance. The great Protestant tradition fairly overpowered him.<sup>2</sup> He seems to have thought the facts too notorious to need investigation. Against the testimony of every Mass that is offered up, of every Sacrament that is administered and received, in opposition to the witness of all the catechisms that have ever been printed, he firmly believed that the honours rendered to the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, detract from 'the supreme Incommunicable Glory of the One Infinite and Eternal.' It would be almost as unreasonable and unreal to talk of the second Precept of Charity interfering with the first.

His prejudice died hard. In fairness it must be remembered that it had its root in a 'z el for God.' Some misgivings as to his *zeal* being strictly 'according to knowledge' seem to have effected an entrance into his mind towards the end of 1842; for in the November of that year he is found promising Dr. Russell of Maynooth, that if ever it was brought home to him that he was wrong, a public avowal of that conviction would only be a question of time with him. A volume of sermons by St. Alphonsus, sent him by Dr. Russell, had impressed him favourably. A short time afterwards he studied the Exercises of St. Ignatius. 'Sola cum Solo'—the one object of these Exercises was to place the soul directly and immediately in the Presence of its Maker. Later on Dr. Russell sent him from Rome a bundle of penny and halfpenny Italian books of devotion. He read them and was astonished to find how different they were from what he had fancied. Nevertheless he was still unconvinced. In May 1843 he publicly retracted a number of his anti-Catholic statements. How eagerly Dr. Russell must have searched for the 'public avowal' of which Newman had held out hopes! But some time had still to elapse before he might have said with a good conscience:

'This I know full well now, and did not know then,

<sup>1</sup> It was with great reluctance, after 1841, that he spoke out his mind upon this matter.

<sup>2</sup> One is reminded of another mighty tradition which has sprung up in our own days, and tampers not merely with history but contemporary events. German professors, German priests and Bishops seem to be honestly convinced that England sought for the present war.



that the Catholic Church allows no image of any sort, material or immaterial, no dogmatic symbol, no rite, no sacrament, no saint, not even the Blessed Virgin herself, to come between the soul and its Creator. It is face to face, "solus cum solo," in all matters between man and his God. He alone creates, He alone has redeemed; before His awful eyes we go in death; in the vision of Him is our eternal beatitude.<sup>1</sup>

The Bishops had obtained the discontinuance of the 'Tracts for the Times'; they had got from Newman the Letter to the Bishop of Oxford in which he recorded, without protest, that in his Bishop's judgment Tract 90 was 'objectionable'; in return he had been given to understand that so far as the Bishops were concerned, the affair was terminated.<sup>2</sup> But this was not all. In April 1841 William Palmer (Worcester) having drawn up a Declaration, for which signatures were to be obtained, acknowledging the services which the writers of the Tracts had rendered the Church, was induced by the Bishop of Oxford to suppress it in the interests of peace, though it was, as the Bishop admitted, 'very moderate, and not a whit beyond the strictest justice due.'<sup>3</sup> In the same interests of peace the Archbishop of Canterbury refused to receive addresses from sympathisers with the Tracts because if he did so he would have to receive counter-addresses. Then there was a sudden change of policy. The Archbishop received and promised to give 'grave consideration' to an address from some Evangelicals at Cheltenham, denouncing the 'Tracts for the Times,' and asking for an authoritative condemnation of them by the Bishops. 'Grave consideration' might mean many things, and among them that the Archbishop was going to follow in the wake of public opinion. If this was the case, it would certainly be unwise to let the Evangelicals be the only people who made their opinions heard. Newman's friend, Mr. Bellasis, seems to have been the first to realise the situation, and on January 1, 1842, he wrote to Newman suggesting an address from lawyers, entreating the Archbishop to take no action, and warning him of the danger of unsettling the minds of many persons who accepted the views put forward in the Tracts. The text of the proposed address (it was never presented) can be read in 'Memorials of Serjeant Bellasis,' pp. 57, 58.

<sup>1</sup> *Apologia*, p. 195.    <sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 90.    <sup>3</sup> *Life of Pusey*, vol. ii. pp. 250 ff.

Newman was favourable to the idea. 'It seems to me,' he wrote to Pusey on January 2, enclosing Mr. Bellasis's letter, 'his project is a very desirable one, if it can be done as he hopes. The Archbishop, observe, is *taking a new line*. Last March he stifled addresses *for* the Tracts because they would elicit counter addresses. Now he receives one against them, and that at *such* a moment! As if there was not excitement enough! As if not violence enough on the side he backs up!' To Mr. Bellasis he replied as follows:

J. H. NEWMAN TO E. BELLASIS, Esq.

January 2, 1842.

My dear Mr. Bellasis,—I thank you very much for your letter, which I will send on to Pusey begging him to write to you. Of course I can but give that general *prima facie* opinion which you ask me for. Persons like yourself alone, who are in London and lawyers, can decide on the feasibility of the measure. As far, however, as I have a right to give an opinion, I like the idea of it very much, and quite go along with your reasons.

The Archbishop's answer has grown more and more ominous in my mind, since I read it. Perhaps I am exaggerating, yet there are some considerations I cannot satisfy myself about. First an answer to such an address is a very unusual thing. Then he makes it just at this moment, increasing the existing excitement, and suggesting hope to the very party that is violent—there is no trimming of the balance. And then it argues a change of policy. Last March he put down all addresses from the Clergy *for* the Tracts on the ground that otherwise he could not put down addresses against them. Now he almost takes the initiative and braves the discord which is likely to arise the consequence of it. I really do not think a more serious step has been taken all through, if viewed in the light which forces itself upon one. The words 'grave consideration,' unless used in the light mocking way of the hustings, must imply a great deal.

I have no view at all *what* they mean. Whether he could effect a recognition of 'Protestantism,' or a denial of the possibility of a better understanding than exists between us and Rome, or a *rejectio* of the decrees of Trent—or to take less mighty objects, a repudiation in detail of *any* invocation of Saints, any &c., &c. It is not possible, I suppose, that he could rule anything about the Real Presence. Could he get a Queen's Injunction of Silence, after the precedent of George I? But I am rambling into great speculations. My difficulty is how he can do anything with our divines, except, indeed, express hatred of Rome.

And now excuse the superfluities of this last page, and with every friendly thought that the season suggests,

Believe me to be

Yours very sincerely

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

January 3, 1842.

My dear Hope,—A happy new year to you and all of us—and, what is even more needed to the English Church. I am afraid of moving about Convocation. Not that we should not be in safer hands than in those of the Bishops, but, though it restrained their acts, it would abridge our liberty. Or it might formally recognise our Protestantism. What can we hope from a body, the best members of which, as Hook and Palmer [of Worcester Coll.], defend and subscribe to the Jerusalem Fund (by the bye I could not see Gladstone's name in the last advertisement of Trustees, but perhaps my eyes were in fault) and vote against, or not for Williams, as Manning and S. Wilberforce? Therefore I do not like to be *responsible* for helping to call into existence a body which may embarrass us more than we are at present.

I think your *τόπος* about the Augsburg Confession

a very important one, and directly more men come back will set a friend to work upon it.

I am almost in despair of keeping men together. The only possible way is a monastery. Men want an outlet for their devotional and penitential feelings, and if we do not grant it, to a dead certainty they will go where they can find it. This is the beginning and the end of the matter. Yet the clamour is so great, and will be so much greater, that if I persist, I expect (though I am not speaking from anything that has *occurred*) that I shall be stopped. Not that I have any intention of doing more at present than laying the foundation of what may be.

Do you know that Keble is very much disgusted with Gladstone *in re* Williams? I have done all I can to soothe him, but have not seen him, without which I shall not do much.

Are we really to be beaten in this election (for the Poetry Professorship)? I will tell you a secret (if you care to know it) which not above three or four persons know. We have 480 promises. Is it then hopeless? . . . I don't think our enemies would beat 600; at least, it would be no *triumph*. Do not mention this unless (as a great secret) you think it would tend to our success.

The Bishop of Exeter has for these eight years, ever since the commencement of the Ecclesiastical Commission, been biding his time, and the Duke of Wellington last spring disgusted him much. This both makes it likely that he will now move, and also diminishes the force of the very words you quote, for peradventure they are ordinary with him. I have good hopes that he will.

Ever yours,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

'Men want an outlet for their devotional and *penitential* feelings.' The reader should note these words, for it is a fact which cannot be too much insisted upon, because it is so often ignored, that the Tractarian movement was a call to repentance, and that its spirit was a penitential one based upon a keen realisation of the fearful character of

post-baptismal sin. Without going into the question whether this spirit was excessive or one-sided,<sup>1</sup> a word of caution may not be out of place against labelling it *Novatian*, *Jansenistic*, or *Calvinistic*. The Novatians excluded the penitent sinner from Holy Communion, the Tractarians did not: The Jansenists discouraged, the Tractarians encouraged frequent communion. Works of penance were repugnant to the Calvinistic system, they were an integral part of that of the Tractarians. But it is probably useless to protest against the misuse of these terms. If Newman had written the exercises of St. Ignatius, traces of his early Calvinism would have been discovered in them.

J. H. NEWMAN TO E. BELLASIS, Esq.

January 5, 1842.

Dear Mr. Bellasis,—It certainly seems best to leave out any opinion about the Tract—the effect would be quite the same without it.

I suppose the Archbishop should be addressed as Primate, or as President of Convocation, or with some explanation which will remove appearance of admitting his *jurisdiction* in the Diocese of London—a consideration which is important at this time.

Nor am I quite clear about the expedience of suggesting Convocation. If people in London feel the desirableness of its meeting, well and good. I only mean that the words should be used with a clear view of their importance.

There is something awkward perhaps in the *form* of the Address, though I cannot quite describe what I mean. The clause about doing nothing in this time of excitement, though very much to the purpose, seems rather free. Hope is at Salisbury for ten days.

Excuse these very abrupt remarks, and believe me to be,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

<sup>1</sup> One would have to inquire into the views of the leaders about a covenanted pardon in the Sacrament of Penance for post-baptismal sin, and it would have to be remembered that their views were in process of formation: It is very likely that the result of such an inquiry would be that Pusey went ahead of Newman.

J. H. NEWMAN TO S. F. WOOD, Esq.

Oriel College : January 8, 1842.

My dear Wood,—I have been thinking over your leaving Margaret Street, and think you should not—that is, unless your continuing there grows very irksome to you. At the present time it is important for the sake of those who are, or who are likely to be, there, that a person with the peculiar views you hold, should be there. It ever will be a very rare thing for a person to despair of our external state as you do, and yet be content to remain in it. I think you can be of great use to other men in directing their thoughts to interior religion as a sufficient occupation, to say the least, for the present—and unless you seriously object to it on personal grounds, I would have you reflect whether it be not your duty at the present time; that which Providence marks out for you. No one can tell how much there is in sympathy, over and above the influence one may have in *withstanding*. Many a man has latent wishes to remain quiet, which are overborne by temptation, but gather strength and become sovereign over his conduct, when he finds another is acting upon the like. This place is not your sphere—else I doubt not you would do much good here to some persons. Ward you will often see at Oakeley's—and though he is not a man to be carried away, yet I feel sure that you would do him good by developing his tendencies to quiet, in the way I have mentioned.

Of course I know too little of what you find suits you and what not to say—I should say else, it might be a soothing and tranquillizing duty as regards yourself thus to employ yourself, without effort, but naturally. You are older than most of the persons who are likely to be there.

Ever yrs. affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO S. F. WOOD, Esq.

Oriel : January 17, 1842.

My dear Wood,—I think I quite understand your ground. What I meant was the *fact* of a person of your

views continuing in the English Church was an evidence that it was *possible* to stay in it with those views—and a grave suggestion to another whether it might not be his own duty. I am not unwilling to view it as a personal matter—but what I should so fear in my own case, would be the turning of my back (if it be reverent so to express myself) on a Divine Presence.<sup>1</sup> 'To whom shall we go?' did I leave what is given—how know I, I should ever find it again in another system, though that system might be in itself better? I know of but two reasons for changing—(1) not having [*word missing*], (2) a divine intimation.

By mysticism I meant simply a neglect of Church ordinances as such—and thinking to gain grace quite as well from private devotion.

Let me ask you three questions, which I do *very* earnestly and not idly :

1. Is G. Babington your medical man ?
2. Do you think he understands you ?
3. Have you taken any other advice ?

Ever yrs affectionately

J. H. N.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

Oriel : January 17, 1842.

My dear Hope,—I have set a man to work at Melancthon.

As to the Act of Henry VIII., it is *known* here as the Bishop of London's ground. Who ever heard of *tacit* Dispensations? The simple question surely is, *has* the Archbishop acted under the Act? The very act of *declaring* a dispensation vindicates the *fact* of the law, according to *Exceptio probat regulam*. Does the Pope give dispensations in his sleep, or are they registered?

Ever yrs.,

J. H. NEWMAN.

The present generation finds it difficult to understand the reverence in which the Reformers were held seventy

<sup>1</sup> The word is uncertain. In the transcript of the letter there is only a P.

and eighty years ago. They were looked upon as mirrors of all virtue, and as teachers little short of inspired. Hurrell Froude, who was followed by Keble and Newman, began to pull them down from their pedestals. On this point Tractarian opinion was not united. Pusey and Manning, for example, judged them on the whole favourably.<sup>1</sup> The following is the rough draft of a letter to an unknown correspondent who had apparently taken umbrage at something which Newman was reported to have said against the Reformers.

J. H. NEWMAN TO AN UNKNOWN CORRESPONDENT

January 18, 1842.

Dear Sir,—I am sure your letter is dictated by kindly feelings, and am sorry you should have heard so incorrect a report of what I said in a late sermon as to ask: ‘Is this a fitting statement for an Anglican clergyman? is this a right instruction to give to his flock?’

At this moment nothing that comes from me can be taken fairly and as I mean it. If I preach sermons 17 years old, secret meanings are found in them. And, as to other sermons, minds at ease are ill judges of the needs of troubled ones. One man welcomes as a relief what another can do nothing but criticize; not that he is unsettled by it, but he fancies that every one else will be. Such words as your informant has led you to address to me, should rather be addressed to my Bishop. You write warmly, as one who sees and feels for a certain portion of the religious community, and does not see another who [which] may perhaps be engaging the attention of the parties he blames. When you speak of my spoiling ‘a good work,’ you must let me say plainly that I never proposed to myself at starting to take another man’s views of what is good and what is bad. Each man has his own views; one man may criticize another’s; let us leave off this unprofitable labour, let

<sup>1</sup> Pusey was ready to subscribe to the Martyrs’ Memorial. Newman was perfectly clear that, for his part, he could not and would not. The memorial was intended as a trap for the Tractarians—to show to the world at large how unfilial their dispositions were to men who, it is hardly an exaggeration to say, were at that time popularly reputed to be the founders of *real* English Christianity.



us take each other's opinions as *facts*, when they are not counter to one common profession, and learn to bear each other. Have I nothing to bear when others praise the Reformers? Be sure I shall not hesitate in turn on fitting occasions to express my own contrary judgment about them. And should you, as you intend, think it necessary to procure the Protest of a number of persons against me, I should count it as adding to the distractions of our Church.

I make no apology for writing thus freely, both because I am persuaded I am addressing a fair and candid mind, and because I am invited to speak plainly by the example of your own letter.

The following letter is of interest in connection with Newman's Letter on Dr. Pusey's Tract on Holy Baptism,<sup>1</sup> and his Lectures on Justification. It has not been thought necessary to point out where he diverges in terminology, if in nothing further, from the teaching he was afterwards to receive from Father Perrone, S.J., and others at Rome.

#### LETTER TO REV. A. TARBUTT

Oriel College: January 22, 1842.

My dear Tarbutt,—I am very glad to answer, to the best of my knowledge, any questions you choose to ask me. As to the particular one about which you write I should say this:

Grace is in Scripture a word confined to Christianity—other dispensations contain a grant or at least a presence of God's *favor* and *aid*, but the peculiar acceptance, and will, and power granted in the Gospel, high above all gifts of other covenants, is Grace. Thus St. John says, 'the Law was given by Moses, but grace and truth came' etc. And St. Paul, 'Where sin abounded grace did much more abound.'

I think then a State of Grace is that state 'in which we stand by faith,' by the mercy of God in Christ; and that it was not vouchsafed to the world till Christ came; and that all these words, grace, life, righteousness, truth, light etc. do not indeed mean the same thing, but all coincide in one and the same subject. I mean that there is *one* certain

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted in *Via Media*, vol. ii.

state, and that it, viewed on different sides of it, is in one aspect grace, in another truth, in another salvation, etc. just as you would say that God is One, and in one view of Him Eternal, and in another Almighty etc., by which you do not mean to say that eternity is the same as omnipotence, but that the two coincide in one and the same subject.

I think then that a person who falls from the state of Salvation, falls from the state of Grace, that state which 'the glory of the Lamb enlightens,' whether for peace, acceptance, holiness, love etc., etc. But in saying that it is plain, I do not intend to say anything so extreme as that a person who falls from a state of Grace is therefore left without God's aids and providential leadings. How do men (adults) originally come for baptism? they are not yet justified or in a state of Grace—they are heathen—but God, whose mercies are over all His works, draws them to a state of Grace by assistances which He gives apart from that state—thus when He *called* them He also *justified*, that is, a state in which a man is helped is prior to that which is the state of Grace. When a man falls from Grace, he relapses into some such state.

If I understand you, the question turns on the *meaning* of the word 'grace'—whether it stands for *any* divine help, or the help through the Spirit of Christ. Yet [Yes?] <sup>1</sup> I do not think it an indifferent question—first because *Sacrifice* [Scripture?] seems to confine 'grace' to the Christian covenant—next because grace conveys the two *ideas* of acceptance *and* spiritual aid—whereas the deeds done by unjustified men, even through God's sacred aid, are not pleasing to God, on account of original corruption which is imputed to them, till they come within the Covenant.

Yours very truly,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—As to your case of the Prodigal Son, I quite agree with what you say. He who has once been God's son, never can be such as he was before. His privileges

<sup>1</sup> This letter is copied from a transcript, not from the original.

are not *forfeited* (except he commit the sin against the Holy Ghost about which we know nothing) but suspended. He falls out of Grace, but not into the same state as he was in before he came into it. The analogy of friendship will explain what I mean. A person whom we have loved and who has turned out ill and broken from us, is not our *friend*, but he is not what he was when he was a stranger. We have deep feelings about him—we are angry yet we love—feel resentment yet affection—or rather resentment *because* we feel affection. The Prodigal Son left the state of Grace when he left his father's house. The father's *going out* after him when a great way off means no more than what I said above, that God's love extends beyond the Home of His Saints and the Church of His Elect. He went out to recover, as originally Christ came to 'seek and to save that which was lost'—to such then in order by bringing them into a state of Grace to save them. So the householder, as we have read this morning, *went out* to hire labourers and bring them into his Vineyard.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

January 29, 1842.

My dear Hope,—I am told Convocation meets in the Jerusalem Chambers next week to present an Address to the King of Prussia. Is anything bad likely to be done?

Would it do good or harm, irritate or retard them, to send my protest to both Houses? and if so, formally or privately? to their President and Prolocutor? or to some individuals to *show*? and if so, to *whom*? The Bishop of Oxford *has* it in the Upper House; but the Bishop of Exeter *might*, I suppose, *have seen it*, and be able to report it. And who in the Lower?

You have the means of knowing all this better than I. If you answer at once, I shall hear to-morrow morning.

Ever yrs.,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

Oriol : January 31, 1842.

My dear Hope,—Thanks for the trouble you have taken. I wrote in a *very* great hurry to save the post, or I would have told you that my authority was a member of Convocation. Through Badeley's kind inquiries word has come to me which you know yourself now, that the meeting is on Friday next for an Address to the Queen on the birth of the P. of W. (I was told it would be the beginning of the week.) A clause may be smuggled in if no one is on the look out. Of course, if I could, I would avoid giving the Protest to any one—merely because it is very unpleasant to bring oneself forward. It may be laziness, but I am much inclined to let it alone. If, however, you think it any good, or best for safety sake, I should prefer the Dean of Chichester to Manning.

My Luther and Melancthon man has made a failure, though he has taken a good deal of pains. I think I must see to it myself. It would not take me much time, if I had *any*. Tell me something about your controversial prospects. I have not seen Maurice yet.

I hope you are not over-working yourself. You mind, I hope, all that medical men would have you do. Are you sure that you are not in too much excitement?

Ever yrs,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO E. L. BADELEY, Esq.

Oriol College : January 31, 1842.

My dear Badeley,—I am very much obliged to you both for your note, and your kind offer of letting me trouble you on any like occasion. In consequence of what you said to Mr. Bellasis, 'A member of Convocation,' who does not wish his name mentioned, has told Oakeley that the meeting of C. is on Friday and for the purpose of an address to the Queen upon the birth of the Prince of Wales. I like your idea of giving my Protest to the Dean of Chichester—but I do not know him—do you? At the same time I fear

it will make him think me gone mad. I have no objection to let you see it, over and above this, that you will think I have been frightened out of my proprieties. Hope has it—if he cannot lay his hand on it, I will send it to you.

I am, my dear Badeley,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. W. DODSWORTH

Oriel College : February 1, 1842.

My dear Mr. Dodsworth,—The very morning your letter came I had mislaid my Prayer Book, and have only just now found it. On referring I find it reads, 'The *Sacrifice* of Masses'—but I have not the slightest doubt it is a misprint. It is one of Reeve's dated London 1811. As to 'Priests' I think that is my Printer's fault, as the run of the sentence 'Priest did offer' is so fixed in my memory. I am much obliged to you for the correction, and am glad the mistake is not one which tells against me.

Your pamphlet pleased me very much, and promises to be useful, though you have not been led to dwell upon Sibthorpe's main argument. You have rightly expressed my own meaning in Tract 90, as far as you have had occasion to bring it out,—and I thank you for the kindness which led you to do so.

Nothing, I trust, will come of the meeting of Convocation on Friday—but, considering the subject, one could easily fancy a clause smuggled in in favour of the King of Prussia. One does not like to speak against anything so pleasing *in itself* as the King of Prussia praying with the prisoners in Newgate, but surely considering that the officiating Minister was a Quaker and a woman, such an occurrence is quite enough to make us suspicious of the Prussian connection. Was the Ordinary present?

Yours very truly,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

Feb. 2. P.S.—In what I have said above, of course I do not mean to enter into the question of my Tract as *between you and Mr. Sibthorpe*.

J. H. NEWMAN TO E. L. BADELEY, Esq.

February 10, 1842.

My dear Badeley,—Thank you for your very kind note, which I answer now, not as if I had anything particular to say, but lest I should seem unmindful of its friendship.

As to the Lutherans, or rather Lutheranism, I consider that the *ecclesiastical* notes of an heresy are *external*, and in the Protest I had given two, 'rising late,' and 'disowned by East and West.' As the Church is known by its outward marks, so is heresy. There is the more reason to say this in this particular case, because I do not profess to know Lutheranism as a system, or to know its history sufficiently to undertake to define it. The main heresy, as it appears to me, is its doctrine of justification, which Melancthon could only defend by explaining away, but which in spite of Melancthon has succeeded in destroying belief in the 'Holy Church Catholic' far and wide. Magd. Palmer considers the heresy to lie in its doctrine of Private judgment—which perhaps is another side of the same substantial error. I fear many more heresies might be mentioned as taught in Lutheranism, though it may be difficult to name the *πρώτον ψεύδος*.

As to Melancthon, it is not uncommon in the case of great heresies to have a milder and a more virulent type. Such in Arianism were Eusebius on the one hand, Arius or Eunomius on the other. Such again Dioscorus or the Monophysites, and Eutyches. The milder form is generally an unreal doctrine, which happily keeps individuals from what is worse, but has no life in it and no general influence.

I am, My dear Badeley,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

Littlemore: February 9, 1842.

My dear Hope,—Your letters were very acceptable—and, since silence is the best of all news in some cases,

I am well pleased I have heard not a whisper, from any quarter, of the result of the meeting of Convocation.

The only news in Oxford is that the Heads are concocting a theological statute. Will it *walk* when made? or will it be a Frankenstein, and walk too much? the 'Via Media' is what is desirable—but how to effect it—that is the problem.

As to Manning, about anyone I do not see, I will be guided quite willingly by your testimony. And in like manner about Gladstone. Thank you for your letter about him, and for the news of his withdrawing from the Jerusalem Trust, which I had supposed to be the case. Every one must admire a man like Gladstone, in spite of his Tylerizing.

Forbes has returned and been unable to procure me any one book—which speaks well for your diligence. The only one I regret is the 'Stapleton.' As he has mislaid his papers, I cannot ascertain what was done about it. I fear I begin to covet a 'Stapleton.'

Yours very sincerely,

JOHN H. NEWMAN

J. H. NEWMAN TO E. BELLASIS, Esq.

Littlemore: February 10, 1842.

My dear Mr. Bellasis,—I quite understand what were the reasons which led to the delay in the document which you had projected. And I am more than disposed to think that you are right in delaying it. It is true that the want of sympathy is the trial of various persons up and down the country, and is in a certain sense preying on their minds and doing them harm—but it calls for nothing *immediate*, nor would be removed by one manifestation. You lawyers are far too powerful a gun not to be reserved for some great occasion—and, with much gratitude for the personal feeling which in the case of yourself and others is united to an interest in the principles in jeopardy, still I sincerely hope you may not have occasion to come forward.

Meanwhile both parties, Ultra Protestants and R. Catholics, consider that the Government is leaguings with the Bishops to exterminate us ; being led by their wishes. I do not see how it is possible.

I am, yours very truly,  
JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO E. BELLASIS, Esq.

Littlemore : February 16, 1842.

My dear Mr. Bellasis,—Ward had sent me your letter and the drafts of the addresses. I am very much obliged by the kind consideration you show towards myself, and assure you I feel it much. I do not know that it makes me unhappy at all, because it somehow seems to be my lot, but certainly hardly anything is said to me or comes to me, even from friends, of a sympathetic character. The truth is, I suppose it is difficult for them to put themselves into my place. This only makes one more grateful to those who do. When I say that it is my lot, I mean that eight years ago just the same suspicion, coldness, nay blackness of face was shown towards me as now, though of course now there are in some quarters much more acrimonious feelings. However, this too perhaps had the effect of making me more callous than I should be. I mean, that, as it seemed I could not please people, I have been very little solicitous to do so. And yet in the case of individuals I have taken vast pains in vain, as, for instance, in the case of the Bishop of Chichester. But however habituated one may be to bear ice and snow as one's climate, I don't suppose it ceases to be the nature of things that sunshine and zephyrs are the more pleasant of the two ; and I thank you for the friendly words which have been wafted from Bedford Square.

Pray excuse all this, which I am almost ashamed to have written. As to your proposal, I certainly agree with Dodsworth, that it is expedient to do nothing at present—*Omne ignotum pro magifico* will tell more with the Bishop



of London than signatures on paper. And again, though this perhaps is not so much with the laity, there is at this moment an irritation against us even among our friends, which in time will be succeeded by *resignation* and making the best of things—so that many persons if left to themselves would come round, who would start from, or be even more alienated by a declaration in our favour. If we are able quietly to keep our ground, there must be a re-action in our favour, and it is well perhaps quietly to wait for it.

Yours most truly,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—What I have said of course does not apply to the Lawyers' Manifesto on an emergency.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO A LAYMAN

Littlemore : March 6, 1842.

Dear Sir,—I willingly would say anything in my power to relieve your mind. Perhaps Dr. Pusey's Letter to the Archbishop, just published, will tend that way.

When it is said that persons of Catholic principles are going or gone to Rome, I beg to ask *how many* persons of so-called Evangelical sentiments, especially of the lower classes have joined the Wesleyans or Dissenters. It is quite notorious that *their* principles are quite a school of dissent and make seceders by wholesale. They almost profess that there is no substantial difference between their own faith and that of the Wesleyans. It is really preposterous that they should cry out against a mote in their brother's eye with so great a beam in their own.

Next I would say that *of course* Church principles will lead to Rome, if our Bishops repudiate them. Did our whole communion solemnly and formally enact that there was *no* Church, or that itself was not part of it, in so unequal a contest between the Creed and a human decree it is quite clear which would be worsted. 'On whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder.' And what would be

awfully fulfilled by a formal act, is fulfilled in its measure by the act of individual bishops, or local parties of our Church. They are taking part against Christ when they speak against the Church, and will lose her children. I make no excuse then, I do but grieve while I say that many secessions will to a certainty take place, *should* our authorities infringe that Apostolic Creed which is the necessary condition of their power, and warrant of their claim upon a Christian's allegiance. It is my confident trust that so deplorable an event will not take place, but I say now, as I have always said, that, while I will pay unlimited obedience to the Bishop set over me while he comes in Christ's name, yet to one who comes in the name of man, in his own name, in the name of mere expedience, reason, national convenience and the like, to the neglect of that Creed which speaks of the Catholic Church, I should not be bound to pay him any at all.

Church doctrines are a powerful weapon ; they were not sent into the world for nothing ; God's word does not return to Him void. If we will not use them, others will instead. If I have ever said, as I have, that the doctrines of the 'Tracts for the Times' would build up our Church and destroy parties, I meant, if they were *used*, not if they were *denounced*. Else they will be as powerful against us, as they might be powerful for us.

As to Mr. Grant I never saw him but twice. Once in mixed society, once since his conversion. I understand he has Roman Catholic relations, and has been in correspondence with them a long while.

You will observe that Sibthorpe traces his conversion to a study of Scripture, and expressly states that the 'Tracts for the Times' were the only anti-Roman works which kept him from Rome. Nor has Mr. Wackerbarth a Cambridge man, anything to do with us.

The truth is Catholicism is, if I may so speak, in the air. It is being breathed. A wonderful power is abroad. The writers of the 'Tracts' have desired that our Church should by acting up to its Catholic principles become a *home* for this Catholic Spirit. That Spirit is not quenched because

we will not entertain it, and numbers are being moved quite independently of any hand or tongue so weak as ours.

But over and above this, the general *cry* that the Church of Rome is spreading, makes young people *curious*, and incites them to take up with its doctrines and practices, though none of us had written a word. I speak of this as a fact. And, still to speak of myself, since you ask about me, if people who have a liking or value for another hear him called Roman Catholic, they will say, 'Then after all Romanism is no such bad thing.' The charge tells two ways—if it does not tell against him in the minds of hearers, it tells for Rome. I am writing you a very free and homely letter, but I do so because I feel very deeply that all these persons, who are working this cry *are fulfilling their own prophecy*. They are tending to its fulfilment in many ways: one way is this. If all the world agrees in telling a man he has no business in our Church, he will at length begin to think he has none. How easy it is to convince a man of anything when numbers affirm it—so great is the force of the imagination. Did every one who met you in the street look hard at you, you would think you were somehow at fault. This is especially the case when *friends* have remonstrated with individuals as Romanizing. I do not know anything so irritating, so unsettling, especially in the case of young persons as they are going on calmly and unconsciously, obeying their own Church and following its divines, (I am speaking from facts) suddenly to their surprise to be conjured not to take a leap, of which they have not a dream and from which they are far removed.<sup>1</sup>

And now will you allow me to conclude this very free letter with a still greater freedom? viz., by observing what is almost superfluous to mention, that it is a comfort to be assured that those who, when in religious perplexity, quietly commit their souls to God in well-doing, who try to please Him, and pray for guidance, will gain, through His mercy, a spiritual judgment for 'trying the spirits,' and

<sup>1</sup> He first wrote and then scratched out 'not to rush into an evil of which they have not a dream and are not in any risk.'

deciding between the claims of opposite arguments, quite sufficiently for their own peace, and their own salvation.

I am, dear Sir, yours truly &c.

J. H. N.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. W. DODSWORTH

Littlemore: March 14, 1842.

My dear Mr. Dodsworth,—I just saw the pamphlet you have been kind enough to send me the other day at Oxford, and what I read of it quite bore out what I hear everyone says of it. It seems to give very great satisfaction to those for whom it seems principally written. I really think that, though there would be some, there would be *very* few conversions to the Church of Rome, if people did but speak with your moderation about her, and your sympathy towards those who are perplexed.

I saw a letter from a person at a distance about Pusey's new publication the other day which illustrates what I mean. I quote it from memory, but nearly *verbatim*. 'I have just seen Pusey's letter. It affected me much. Persons who are troubled about our (the Anglican) state are generally treated with nothing but roughness. I love him for it more than ever.' This was from a person who has had strong temptations to leave our Church, though I trust he is safe. I do not know who is safe, if our Bishops and Clergy disclaim Catholic principles—I do not know who is not safe, if they will but *allow* them. This is not much to ask.

Yours very truly,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—I should not like the above extract mentioned, for though it is far enough from London, yet things get round so strangely.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. W. DODSWORTH

Littlemore: March 17, 1842.

My dear Dodsworth,—The letter of your Bishop amused me very much. He of all men to think a Church could get

on without a centre, an ecclesiastical Commission for instance, or a Metropolitan Board! Let him reform Lambeth and give up his own precedence over other Bishops, nay more his substantial rule, and then he may with cleaner hands come into controversy. Why it has been a saying in people's mouths, owing to late proceedings whether at Lambeth or London House, whether in the Jerusalem matter, or in the Anti-Tract-Lay-Address matter, 'if we *are* to have a Pope, we will not go to Lambeth.' Does not organisation imply organs, and must not organs have a seat?

'Bramhall' is to make its appearance (the first volume) in a few days—I wonder what people will think of his general doctrine. Your extract is most satisfactory. It is very unwise in your Bishop to quote *authorities*. Depend on it, his best way is to repeat the argument he is said to have used apropos of St. Ambrose to poor Mr. Wackerbarth, 'Bishop Bramhall is not your Bishop but C. J. London.'

I agree with you about Palmer; and, if he means to *effect* anything by his pamphlets, his tone is not good. The first excellence of a composition is *to do its work*—what is the work he proposes? Certainly he will not keep men from Rome.

Yours very truly,

JOHN H. NEWMAN

P.S.—In answer to your question, of course it does not seem to me that you have gone too far at all—and I really so little see what the Bishop can reply, that I cannot anticipate new arguments for you. He will only say that in spite of Bishop Bramhall, he thinks the concession very dangerous. Rather Bramhall himself, *totus*, whole and bodily, is dangerous.

J. H. NEWMAN TO E. BELLASIS, Esq.

Littlemore: March 23, 1842.

My dear Bellasis,—Morris tells me that you have taken your degrees in the science of Arnott Stoves. I have got

one on trial at a room of mine here [*the stove occupies both sides of a page of ordinary sized notepaper and then the writer turns to matters of more general interest*]. Since I wrote last, the storm from Lambeth seems blowing off, but I am out of the way of hearing news here—and perhaps am flattering myself unwarrantably. Or perhaps it is merely ‘hushed in grim repose.’

Mr. Bellasis replied :

‘The storm has apparently passed away as you say, but some think that if the Pilots who were some time since placed under hatches for endeavouring to change the moorings of the vessel, are not again allowed to look out and track the helm, there is great danger that she will go ashore, or at least that more of the crew will lose confidence and try to make their escape.’

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

April 4, 1842.

My dear Hope,—A man writes to me to say he is urged to change a district Chapel he has for some other preferment, but he fears to commit simony, i.e. Canonical simony. Have you, as a lawyer, anything to say on this subject?

Can you tell me the legal definition of residence? by which I mean, does the formal cause of it lie in eating in a place, or sleeping, or doing the Sunday duty for the week, or what? I mean *how much* may I be at Littlemore, and yet reside in Oriel, without going to the Bishop for a licence to reside at Littlemore, which I suppose he would give me?

You have got my copy of the Oriel Statutes, which I suppose you can't want by this time—not that I want it just now myself.

There was something else I had to say, but forget.

Tell me how you are.

Ever yrs.,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.<sup>1</sup>

Dabam e Domo S.M.V. apud Littlemore.

April 22, 1842.

My dear Hope,—Does not this portentous date promise to outweigh any negative I can give to your question in the mind of the inquirer? for any one who could ask such a question would think such a dating equivalent to the answer. However, if I must answer in form, I believe it to be one great absurdity and untruth from beginning to end, though it is hard I must answer for *every* hundred men in the *whole* kingdom. Negatives are dangerous: all I can say, however, is that I don't believe, or suspect, or fear any such occurrence, and look upon it as neither probable nor improbable, but simply untrue.

We are all much quieter and more resigned than we were, and are remarkably desirous of building up a position, and proving that the English theory is tenable, or rather, the English state of things. If the Bishops let us alone, the fever will subside.

I hunted for your letter about my books, some time ago, and could not find it. I thought I had put it aside for the purpose of using it. As Stewart valued the books, could he not tell the prices? but I really am very much ashamed of giving you so much trouble. I will look for the letter.

I wish you would say how you are.

Ever yrs.,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

There is a legend of Newman, having been challenged to a public theological debate, replying with a counter proposal of a duet on the violin. The following extract from a letter to Keble perhaps supplies the slender foundation of fact upon which this story was built. The rest of the letter can be read in 'Miss Mozley' (vol. ii. p. 354).

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

April 29, 1842.

Mr. McGhee came up here twice last Sunday—he heard me preach on Baptismal regeneration. Accordingly he

<sup>1</sup> Printed by Miss Mozley, and in *Memoirs of J. R. Hope-Scott*.

sent me a remonstrance of three large sheets full, ending with a *challenge*, to select whom I pleased, e.g. Dr. Pusey as a friend, he would come with a friend—‘stenographers’ he must stipulate for; we were to expound St. Paul’s Epistle to the Romans alternately; they were to take it down verbatim; and it was to be published through the country. It was a piece of simplicity in the worthy man—I might as well propose a duet on the violin, for I am as little able to controvert on a platform, as, I suspect, he is to execute a concerto.

The following is the rough draft of his reply to Mr. McGhee.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. MR. MCGHEE

Littlemore: April 28, 1842.

Rev. Sir,—You will allow me, I am sure, to reply to your frank and kind letter, just received, with equal frankness and with an equally kind intention. Be assured then, Dear Sir, that I am as persuaded of my own religious views as you can be of yours; that I think you as wrong as you think me; and that my feelings concerning protestantism are not at all less strong than your own concerning the Church of Rome. I have before now stood on your ground; it was when I was a very young man.

I am only surprised you should be so late in learning my sentiments, I have long known yours. You need not have told me that you considered me ignorant of the way of Salvation; I knew you did before you said it. Such protests waste time. So would it to accept your challenge. You invite me to viva voce controversy with stenographers, an exercise for which my habits and powers unfit me. Meanwhile, no one has yet attempted a direct and manly encounter with the categorical statement and argument of the work I have published on Justification. Remonstrance, Protestation, Censure, warning, denunciation are an easier task. You will see, Dear Sir, that your trouble is lost upon me. Alas, there are others up and down the country



whom you may be able to terrify, but your cause is a failing one. And surely you are too good a man to be ever taking on you, as at present, the heavy woe of being 'An accuser of the Brethren' and 'making the heart of the righteous sad' and speaking against the work of Divine Grace. May the Author of Grace at length open your eyes, since you 'do it yourself' and 'know not what you do.' I am, with sincere respect for your zeal.

Yours faithfully,

J. H. N.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. W. DODSWORTH

Oriel College: May 11, 1842.

My dear Dodsworth,—I am a very bad person to consult in a case of casuistry—and still more so, when the answer is to be given at once. I can only say what I should do in my own case.

It seems to me very cruel that the Bishops have flung all the responsibility on *us*—and I ever have been for returning it to *them*. I think *I* should be inclined to put it before my own Bishop and refuse to admit the parties either as sponsors or as communicants unless he recommended me. And I should tell him that I could not do it without his recommendation. I take it for granted, from what you say, that in the eye of the Church the marriage is incestuous. And I should tell the parties that I *would* act otherwise *on* the Bishop's recommendation, but could not without.

It is very easy to prescribe for another and I am ashamed almost to send this, both for that reason and because the advice is meagre and unsatisfactory. I can only say that I acted on it myself some years since, on one or two occasions—e.g. the burial of a suicide—and (as far as I could) the marriage of an unbaptized person.

Yours very truly,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

Littlemore : August 28, 1842.

My dear Hope,—Your Cook's place is vacant, and it is in the gift of the Warden. Norris, our Common Room man, has come to me and wants me to exert my influence with you to exert your influence with the Warden that his son may be the new one. Having said as much as this, I leave it to you to inquire more, supposing you see reason to do so. Norris is a very respectable man, and I should be very glad to find his son successful.

But I am glad of this excuse to write to you. I want to know how you are, if you can spare five minutes—both in body and mind—whether you are more or less disgusted than you were at Whitsuntide at the state of things—whether you are hopeful or hopeless. Your Scotch Bishops are resolved (prudently enough) to put themselves simply under the direction of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London—and of another sort of authority too, for when Palmer pressed them the other day on some point, one answered ' If I were to say so, I should lose half my flock,' an arrangement [query argument] which I do not find noticed in Lumper's ' *Vitae Patrum* ' or Schram's ' *Analysis* '—(but I suppose it is best not to mention this) but is a wholesome doctrine, necessary for these times.

What do you think the Americans have done? Their presiding Bishop, Greswold, has formally, and with an expression of general concurrence, admitted a Nestorian as a Nestorian to Holy Communion. I think I must screw up, not courage, but zeal, to write to some one in America about it. I wish you would turn it in your thoughts. I have seen no *document* or *account in print* yet. It struck me I might write to Dr. Jarvis, who threw out a feeler on the subject a year or two since, and sent me his sermon. I then wrote to him, deprecating such a course, but far too mildly. I do not see the good of writing to him in private though—yet if it were a thing to be published, people would say what business has an Englishman with us.<sup>1</sup> The

<sup>1</sup> Palmer of Worcester is *the* man who is bound to take it up.

question is full of difficulty ; since they and we have given up Church authority. To go into the controversy, considering foreign and dead languages are concerned in it, would be interminable—yet how appeal to a sentence of a Council, considering the many we make no bones of ? It is straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel. We English, can fall back upon the act of Elizabeth—but our Sister Church has no such refuge.

Ever yrs,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

On September 12 Newman wrote a long letter to Keble which has been published by Miss Mozley with the omission of the two concluding paragraphs. Any reasons for withholding the first of these which may have been felt in 1890 have certainly lapsed by now. The second is merely one of the many touching proofs which we have of the writer's love for Pusey, and his anxious forebodings, too well justified in the event, about the health of the young Puseys.

With you I have but subdued expectations of the Scotch Church—Copeland first broke one's hopes. There will be no good there or anywhere else, till the doctrine of post-baptismal sin is recognised. N., N., and the Bishop of Exeter combine with the Cambridge Camden, in making a fair outside, while within are dead men's bones. We shall do nothing till we have a severer religion.

Pusey is pretty well—looks better—but has had the influenza—children, *he* says, better on the whole. I don't believe it. He is sorely harassed by a Romanising case on which he has gone out of his way to waste his strength, and which seems interminable.

Ever yours affectly,

J. H. N.

The following letter contains advice as much to the purpose to-day as it was in 1842. Any one who is in the habit of picking up second-hand copies of the 'Fathers' will from time to time find himself on the traces of those who have begun to read the 'Fathers,' and then, presumably, come to the conclusion that they were wasting their time. A few

pages cut, perhaps disfigured with pencil notes, and the rest of the book as good as new. Newman wrote from experience. In 1828, he tells us, 'I first began to read their writings with attention and on system. I busied myself much in analysing them, and in cataloguing their doctrines and principles,' but he came to the conclusion that there was 'very little in them. At the time I did not discover the reason of this result, though on the retrospect it was plain enough: I had read them simply on Protestant ideas, analysed them and catalogued them on Protestant principles of division, and hunted for Protestant doctrines and usages in them. My headings ran, "Justification by faith only," "Sanctification" and the like. I knew not what to look for in them; I sought what was not there, I missed what was there; I laboured through the night and caught nothing.'<sup>1</sup>

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. T. W. ALLIES

Oriel College: September 30, 1842.

My dear Mr. Allies,—I had an opportunity yesterday of thanking you for the very kind expressions which you used about me in your letter, and I will now proceed to the question it contained. When I began to read the 'Fathers' many years ago, I began at the Apostolical, and took a great deal of pains with them and Justin Martyr—all which I count now almost wasted—and that for this reason, that I did not understand *what* was in them, what I was to look for, what were the strong and important points, etc. I measured and systematized them by the Protestant doctrines and views, and by this sort of cross division I managed to spend a good deal of time on them and got nothing from them. The result was something like that described in the case of the unobservant boy in the story of 'Eyes and No Eyes.'

This has ever since made me averse to persons reading the 'Fathers' without first getting some acquaintance with divinity; or at least letting the study of the two proceed together; or again some acquaintance with Ecclesiastical

<sup>1</sup> 'But,' he continues, 'I should make one important exception: I rose from their perusal with a vivid perception of the divine institution, the prerogatives, and the gifts of the Episcopate; that is, with an implicit aversion to the Erastian principle.'—*Diff. of Ang.*, i. 371-2.

History. If a person's taste goes that way, Bull's 'Defensio F.N.' is an admirable introduction to the 'Fathers,' so I think is Hooker's 'Fifth Book'; or Wall on 'Infant Baptism.' It comes pretty much to the same thing to advise a person to get up a particular controversy in the 'Fathers,' for that involves more or less his going to theological works for information. E.g. the Donatist controversy will bring him across a great deal of history, and some very interesting Treatises of St. Augustine, as well as Optatus. If I must name one work, however, and that of an early Father, it must be 'Origen contra Celsum,' and then he might go on to 'Huet.' Or again, St. Cyprian's Epistles, getting up the dates etc. It is best to get a footing in some one place, and then to proceed as our particular taste or curiosity leads. Bishop Lloyd used to recommend beginning at the beginning—I have found this in my own case a failure. Burton pushed it too, and I cannot think his influence sufficient to alter my opinion. He is said to have read regularly on through four centuries—so I understood Lloyd; but has learned little from the 'Fathers' except that they were not Socinians. Bishop Kaye, to judge from his publications, has proceeded in the same orderly way—accordingly, since a man must have some system, he has naturally taken his own with him, and transforms Tertullian into the Thirty-nine Articles one after another. I think Tertullian would be surprised to see himself in the Bishop's pages.

The following document is described in the 'Apologia,' where a short extract from it is quoted, as 'Notes of a letter which I sent to Dr. Pusey.'<sup>1</sup> The 'notes' themselves seem to have been sent to Pusey, and were returned, or at least the portion of them now printed, by him with remarks at the end. They give a vivid picture of Newman's relations with the party of Oakeley and Ward, and the perplexity he was often in when plied with questions which he did not see clearly how to answer.<sup>2</sup> The 'Article on Rio' spoken of was an historical article, in the October number of the

<sup>1</sup> *Apologia*, p. 171.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Apologia*, pp. 163-171.

'British Critic,' on Rio's *La Petite Chouannerie ; ou Histoire d'un Collège Breton sous l'Empire*.

October 16, 1842.

N.B.—It is most difficult to me to analyze the difference between you and Ward. I have always thought it consisted (1) in matters of history not of doctrine. (2) in questions of expedience, propriety, piety, considerateness, etc. (3) in the certainty or probability of certain developments. In all these matters I have great uncertainty myself, and I feel that much may be said on both sides ; I certainly should be willing to tolerate both sides, except that as regards the first head, I have no sympathy at all with the Reformation, its agents, and leading defenders. As to the second head I have been accustomed to say ' what is one man's meat is another man's poison.'

As to the article on Rio, I thought it spoke of the Roman Church and the Pope *historically* without going into the question of doctrine. Surely Napoleon did fight with the Church, and the Pope was the head and representative of the Church as he fought with it. I did not consider that it need mean more than this—though as to the matter of doctrine, I certainly do think the Pope the Head of the Church. Nay I thought all churchmen so thought ; only they said that his doctrine, tyranny etc. suspended his just powers here.

I did not express a *wish* that R. W. *shd tell* G. that union with Rome was the *object* of the more recent development of church principles—Such a statement implies something—something I wished to be done. Ward told me that G. *had* been in a puzzle *what* Oakeley was aiming at, and R. W., when he asked about it, seemed to be beating about the bush—and said he ought, if he wished to state what the difficulty was which was agitating so many minds, to have said, that it was the question of union with Rome—G. seemed in a maze *why* people could not be still—this would, with whatever pain, have put an end to his maze. I need not point out in how many particulars this account differs from Oakeley's.

As to the *approving* of others doing what I do not do myself, this is hardly the case. In certain cases I have *not disapproved* it. I have liked the *subject* of Ward's articles—I have thought the *substance* remarkably good and true—I had no reason why it should not be said—but it is another matter whether I should have brought it into being, as it were, could I have seen it before it was done. When a thing *is* done, one must have a strong reason for advising it to be undone. I had no such strong reason. However, that I went so far as not to disapprove is plain from my having seen them before publication. I must add that I had never been myself *pained* at W.'s or O.'s writings, which I know you have been.

<sup>1</sup>As to my being entirely with Oakeley and Ward, I think my sympathies *are* entirely with them; but really I cannot determine whether my opinions are. I do not know the limits of my opinions. If Ward says this or that is a development of what I have said, I cannot say yes or no—It is plausible; it *may* be true—of course the fact that the Roman Church *has* so developed and maintained, adds great weight to the antecedent plausibility—I cannot assert that it is not true; but I cannot with the keen perception which some people have, appropriate it. It is a nuisance to me to be *forced* beyond what I can fairly go.

I have intended ever since the Bp. of Salisbury's charge to take the first public opportunity which occurred of saying that I agreed with the substance of Ward and Oakeley's articles.

I think either the whole of this or nothing should be told to Oakeley.

G. and W. in the above must be Gladstone and Robert Williams respectively. What Mr. Gladstone was told about Newman is not on record. But in July 1842 Mr. Williams gave him information about 'the general view of the ulterior section of the Oxford writers and their friends' which astonished him. Oakeley and his friends, it seemed, looked forward to reunion with Rome, without, however,

<sup>1</sup> This paragraph is quoted in the *Apologia*, p. 171.

having any definite plans to bring it about. They could remain in the Church of England, and render absolute obedience to their ecclesiastical superiors, so long as they did not think any Roman doctrine defined as *de fide* was dogmatically condemned by the Church of England. 'They expect to work on in perfect harmony with those who look mainly to the restoration of Catholic ideas on the foundation laid by the Church of England as reformed, and who take a different view as to reunion with Rome in particular, though of course desiring the reunion of the whole body of Christ. All this,' commented Mr. Gladstone, 'is matter for serious consideration. In the meanwhile I am anxious to put it down while fresh.'<sup>1</sup>

One cannot, of course, be sure that Mr. Williams would have fully endorsed Mr. Gladstone's account of what he told him; or that Oakeley and his friends would have accepted every word of Mr. Williams' description of their views. Opinions in process of formation are hardly capable of accurate description, and each person, as he reports them, will almost inevitably, though quite unconsciously, add something to them, to make them coherent and complete. In other words, he will develop them. But there is no reason to doubt the substantial accuracy of the information as supplied to Mr. Gladstone, and put down in writing by him.

It is easy to understand Newman's perplexity, when eagerly plied with questions by men like Ward and Oakeley. Nothing is harder than to discover how far one agrees with men who approach a question from a point of view from which one does not oneself contemplate it. Newman may be represented as holding that England had much to learn, and Rome much to unlearn. The New School, on the other hand, simply regarded Rome as the living model of Catholicity to which the Church of England must adapt herself. Here, it may be said, was a fundamental difference of view which would lead to opposite conclusions. So it might have, if Newman's mind had been stationary, and if he had still held to the *Via Media* as a working theory. In 'Loss and Gain,' two young men are made to compare 'Smith'—in whom one may recognise a faint *imago* of Newman himself—and Dr. Pusey.

"Dr. Pusey," continued Charles, "is said always to be

<sup>1</sup> Morley's *Life of Gladstone*, vol. i, chap. xi.



decisive. He says, ' This is Apostolic, that's in the Fathers ' ; St Cyprian says this, St. Augustine denies that ; this is safe, that's wrong."

' " But the Puseyites are not always so distinct," said Sheffield ; " there's Smith—he never speaks decidedly on difficult questions." ' <sup>1</sup>

Why could not Newman be as decisive as Dr. Pusey ? Because, having lost the *Via Media*, he had no definite theory upon which to go ; no general principle which he could apply to each question as it arose. Because he had begun to suspect that there was more in the Fathers than he had hitherto been able to see. Because the idea of development was now lodged in his mind. But he was moving slowly and cautiously. ' That Rome had so developed ' was to him a presumption, but not more than a presumption, that a particular development was a legitimate one. To the New School ' that Rome had so developed ' afforded more than a presumption. It was little short of an absolute proof.

<sup>1</sup> *Loss and Gain*, p. 120. The dialogue, which has been very much curtailed, continues thus : " Then he won't have many followers, that's all," said Charles. " But he has more than Dr. Pusey," answered Sheffield. " Well, I can't understand it," said Charles ; " he ought not ; perhaps they won't stay."

## CHAPTER VII

### RESIGNATION OF ST. MARY'S, 1843

Retraction of Anti-Catholic Statements—Newman Reveals his  
Doubts to Keble—Resigns St. Mary's

' Miseremini mei, saltem vos, amici mei, quia manus Domini tetigit me. '

THE chief external events of which the reader of this chapter should be reminded are (1) Newman's public retraction of the fiercest of his anti-Catholic statements; (2) his resignation of St. Mary's; and (3) the suspension of Dr. Pusey.

1. The Retraction of Anti-Catholic Statements, to give it the title it bears in the 'Via Media,'<sup>1</sup> where it has been reprinted, was published in the 'Conservative Journal' during the month of February 1843. The writer had intended it to appear two months earlier, and dated it December 12. As a literary document it is probably quite unique in its style. It deals with the most personal matters and, except for the use of the first person, is most impersonal in form. The customary opening of a letter, 'Sir,' or 'Dear Sir,' is omitted, and so is the conventional ending. It was merely headed *To the Editor*, and without a word of explanation or introduction starts off abruptly: 'It is true that I have at various times, in writing against the Roman system, used not merely arguments, about which I am not here speaking, but what reads like declamation.' Then follow a number of instances of such *declamation*, ranging from 1833 to 1837. The year of each is carefully noted, but references to where they were to be found, except in the case of one or two anonymous publications, are not given. The reader was left to find all this out for himself,

<sup>1</sup> At the end of vol. ii.

if he chanced to remember the passages, and where he had come across them. The writer in order to aggravate his fault, and make his confession more humiliating, gave many instances of vigorous rebukes addressed to him by an 'intimate friend,'<sup>1</sup> of which the following may serve as a specimen: 'I must enter another protest against your cursing and swearing . . . What good can it do? I call it uncharitable to an excess.' And then, in words which seem almost instinct with a spirit of prophecy, 'How mistaken we may ourselves be on many points which are only gradually opening to us.'

Newman had intended, for the sake of his friends, that his retractation should steal upon the world unobserved, without creating a sensation, and only become generally known by the time it was ancient history. The editor of the 'Conservative Journal' did not fall in with this plan. It could hardly be expected that he should sacrifice a column and more of his space to closely printed matter which was not likely to attract the attention of one in a hundred of his readers. It was easy enough to turn an unobtrusive communication into a sensational disclosure by heading it OXFORD AND ROME and prefacing it thus: 'The following letter has been forwarded to us for publication. It is without signature; but we dare say some of our Oxford readers will find no difficulty in fixing upon the name of the writer. For ourselves we give it without note or comment.' So far the editor. On February 20 Mrs. J. Mozley wrote to her brother, 'We hear that that letter which appeared in the "Conservative Journal," which bears every mark of belonging to you, except your name, is making a great hubbub in the world.'

The extent and limits of the retractation are worth noting. The passages withdrawn could only be justified if the writer of them held that Rome had practically unchurched, not to say unchristianised, herself. They read like echoes of the Protestant tradition in which he had been nurtured, viz. that Rome was the Babylon of the Apocalypse.

But none of the less violent, yet still very fierce, things which had been said in Tract 90 and the Letters to Dr. Jelf and the Bishop of Oxford were withdrawn. Nor, however, were they repeated. People would not be slow to

<sup>1</sup> Hurrell Froude.

conclude from this silence that the writer did not see his way either to repeating or recanting them. Yet it may be doubted if, as a matter of fact, the writer at all intended this inference to be drawn. He was intent upon performing, in obedience to the dictates of his conscience, a solemn act of reparation and self-humiliation. To have unsaid some fierce things, and repeated others, even though these latter were in a minor key, would have been like driving a bargain with his conscience and letting himself down easily. But, be this as it may, the Retracting seems universally to have been regarded as a significant and ominous act.

(2) The resignation of St. Mary's was a step which had been long contemplated, and calls for no remark.

(3) The story of Dr. Pusey's suspension has been fully told in his 'Life,' where many facts which at the time were unknown, to all except those immediately concerned, have been brought to light. The offence was a sermon on the Holy Eucharist; the tribunal a court consisting of the Vice-Chancellor and six Doctors of Divinity appointed by him as his assessors; the penalty inflicted was suspension from preaching within the University for two years. The authorities refurbished ancient weapons of defence against false teaching, and amply proved that they were not fitted to handle them. Among other unfairnesses they bound their victim over to a promise of secrecy with regard to some altogether illusory negotiations which they held with him; thus making it impossible for him to take the advice of his friends.

The following letter is an acknowledgment of a present of books from Mr. Hope. It is the first allusion to the library which Newman was amassing out of the proceeds, so rumour said, from the sale of Tract 90. This library is a curious phenomenon. Newman went on adding to it almost up to the end of his Anglican career; yet with the future growing more and more uncertain, it is difficult to understand how he had the heart to burden himself with a great collection of expensive books. Can he have felt it would be an act of secret disloyalty to the communion of which he was a member to take any precautions against the time when he might have to sever his connection with it? Or was he till almost the end hoping against hope that he might see his way to remaining where he was?

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

Oriel : February 10, 1843.

Dear Hope,—Your splendid benefaction has arrived, and I hope we shall make due use of it, and profit by it. I do not quite understand about the cases going free—if you have paid please recollect that I am your debtor, for it does seem a shame that you should frank them down. But anyhow I must mention it, because the people have charged 14s. and it is not fit that they should be paid twice over. Will you let me know?

Ever yours,

J. H. N.

P.S.—I am going to take the liberty to send Roundell Palmer<sup>1</sup> my University Sermons, since they are the least theological book I have published. Will you just take off the abruptness of the present? My chief doubt is that I have inflicted such a favour on him before—but I don't think it likely.

J. H. NEWMAN TO AN UNKNOWN CORRESPONDENT

Littlemore : March 4, 1843

Dear Sir,—Though I have not a sufficiently vivid memory of the contents of the 'Tracts for the Times' to be able to say whether this or that proposition is to be found in them, or can be deduced from them, at least I can and will readily give *my own* opinions, which, I suppose, will on the whole agree with those of the Tracts, as being parts of the same system of doctrine. As to the Tracts, they were not written on certain *theses*, but were the spontaneous development, as called for, of a certain view and system of religion, held by their authors who are various. How much of that system happened to be brought out into formal statement in them, perhaps the authors themselves could not tell—this is the case with every theological work.

1. I do not object to bringing forward the Atonement explicitly and prominently *in itself*, but under<sup>2</sup> circumstances, *i.e.* when people are *unfit* to receive it. I think

<sup>1</sup> Afterwards Lord Selborne.

<sup>2</sup> This word is uncertain.

it should be taught all baptized children—that it is the life of all true Christians—but that it is not the *means of conversion* (ordinarily speaking or in the divine appointment) of those who are *not* religious. I think it ought not to be preached to infidels, immoral men, backsliders, at first, but be *reserved* till they begin to feel the need of it. Consequently I object to the use of it so often made in our pulpits as *the one* doctrine to be addressed to *all*. It is but one *out* of others, and not adapted to all. There are various instruments of persuasion given in Scripture; the most familiar distinction is that of the Law and the Gospel. I consider that at this time the mass of our congregations who have lapsed after baptism require the Law rather than the Gospel. They require to be brought to a sense of sin, and I do not think the preaching of the doctrine of the Atonement is intended to bring them to a sense of sin. Dr. Chalmers thinks otherwise—there then we stand at issue. Dr. Chalmers' Tron Sermons<sup>1</sup> are the best instance I can take of the mode of preaching the Atonement which I would *exclude*—it seems to me very irreverent. He would cast pearls before swine—he would excite the feelings rather than mend the heart; that is, this is the *result* of his mode of preaching, for, of course, he would wish to renew the heart, though I think he takes the wrong way. I will add, first that in preaching the Law, I do not mean, of course, to exclude the preaching of Divine *Love* and *Mercy*—but the insisting specially on the *Atonement*. Secondly the Atonement is not the only doctrine which under circumstances I would withhold—the Incarnation is another. The Apostles in the Acts are almost silent *both* about the Divinity of Christ *and* the Atonement. I only wish to follow their example. St. Paul is said to preach the *faith of Christ* to Festus, where he but insists on righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come. Our Saviour Himself is said to preach *the Gospel*, yet even His death, and much more His Atonement, was a secret during His Ministry.

<sup>1</sup> [Sermons preached at Tron Church.]

2. The 'Rule of Faith' is an ambiguous expression, and I cannot answer your question till I know what you mean by it. It has been a received phrase for 'Scripture' only during the last 150 years, as you will see drawn out in Tract 90. Before that time it was sometimes applied to Scripture, sometimes to the creed, sometimes to both, sometimes to Tradition. In antiquity (as by Tertullian) it is the phrase for Tradition. I think that in Tract 90 I have said that it is best to *avoid* the phrase. The Tracts *nowhere* say that anything need be believed in order to salvation which is not contained in, or [cannot] be proved from Scripture.

3. The promises of forgiveness of sin have as full an application after Baptism as before, but not in the same free instantaneous way. They are regained gradually, with fear and trembling—by repentance, prayer, deprecation, penance, patience.

4. The Eucharist *is* a proper Sacrifice made by the Priest as Christ's *representative*, but only as such.

5. Adherence to Episcopal ordination is the *safest course* for the security of the validity of the Sacraments, and of the existence of Church fellowship.

6. There is nothing *in Scripture* against invocation of Saints. The practice is right or wrong according as the Church allows it or not—but where it is a Church ordinance, still it may be abused.

7. Justification by Faith without the Sacraments<sup>1</sup> is the essence of sectarian and (modern) heretical doctrine.

8. No other *appointed* means but baptism is *revealed in Scripture* for regeneration.

I beg you will excuse my penmanship, but my hand is much tired by overwork.

Yours faithfully,

J. H. N.

The process of conversion as commonly represented by the men whose style of preaching Newman disliked went through the preparatory stages of conviction of sin and

<sup>1</sup> It is not clear whether he meant to write *Sacrament* or *Sacraments*.

terror, before the soul was ready for the tidings of the 'free and full salvation.' Why, then, were they so indignant at the idea of a preacher trying to bring his hearers through the preparatory stages, before he directed their thoughts to the Atonement?

In the following letter Newman consults Keble about resigning St. Mary's. He had already done so in October 1840. The letter he then wrote can be read in the 'Apologia,' pp. 132-135.

All the letters that have been preserved, which passed between Newman and Keble from March 1843 to October 1845, are printed in full, except for some erasures in those of the latter made by the Cardinal towards the end of his life, when he parted with them, and presented them to Keble College, Oxford. He explained these erasures in the following note.<sup>1</sup>

'In the letters which follow I have made erasures, which may seem strange and arbitrary, unless I say something to account for them.

'Let me observe, then, that dear John Keble's heart was too tender and his religious sense too keen, for him not to receive serious injury to his spirits and his mental equilibrium by the long succession of trials in which his place in the Oxford movement involved him.

'The affair of No. 90, Williams' failure in his contest for the Poetry Professorship, the Jerusalem Bishoprick, Young's rejection when offering himself for Orders, Pusey's censure by the six Doctors, the promotion of Thirlwall and others, my own religious unsettlement and that of so many others, the charges and hostile attitude of the Bishops, the publication of Arnold's life and letters, and the prospect of the future thus opened upon him (not to dwell upon the serious illness of his wife and his brother), were too much for him, and threw him into a state of extreme depression, which showed itself to his intimate friends in the language of self-accusation and even of self-abhorrence.

<sup>1</sup> This note, together with considerable portions of Keble's letters, has already been published in Dr. Lock's *Life of Keble*. Some portions of the correspondence were also used by Miss Mozley.



' This heart-rending trial, of which perhaps I saw more than any one, is remarked upon by Sir John Coleridge in his "Life of Keble" (p. 283 etc., ed. 1), though he has not attempted any sufficient explanation of it. He seems to attribute what was a surprise to him to the intense self-disparagement which, however strange to the run of men, is natural to a mind so religious as Keble's. Others have supposed it was a point of duty with Keble thus to speak and write, as being a proper form of introducing a religious sentiment, or what was called in a Bishop's charge some forty years ago, a sort of 'mystic humility'—an imputation most untrue to Keble's nature. It is more exact to say that the idea had grown upon him and vividly possessed him, that he had allowed himself for the last ten or twelve years to be engaged in deep religious questions, and in controversy rising out of them, without adequate preparation. He had set off in the company or at the head of many others, on a road which he had not explored, and as he might think, he had been "the blind leading the blind." And, in particular he considered himself at least indirectly, if not positively, the cause of my own abandonment of the Church of England.

' This impression, however, unless he had been at the time so worried and broken in heart, as I have supposed, would not have been enough in itself to account for the *obiter dicta*, the ejaculations, the single words and half sentences, the language so shocking to one who knew and loved him so well as I did, in which he expressed his sense of the difficulties of the moment and his own responsibility in relation to them.

' To me nothing is more painful than the contrast between the cheerfulness and playfulness which runs through his early letters and the sadness of his later. This must remain anyhow; it is founded on the successive circumstances of his history; it is part of his life; nor could one expect it to be otherwise; but I could not be so cruel to that meek, patient and affectionate soul, to that dearly, deeply beloved friend, as to leave to a future generation the

exhibition of those imaginary thoughts about himself which tormented him, which grew out of grave troubles, which were very real, and which are sufficiently recorded for posterity, when they serve, as in a notice like this, to suggest to a reader the weight of those troubles.'

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore : March 14, 1843.

My dear Keble,—I am sorry to trouble you with my concerns, yet I want to write to you on a subject, which has before led me to apply to you, and which I hardly know how to bring out properly. It seems to me as if Lent were a fitting time, when one has more hope than at ordinary seasons of being guided amid perplexity.

I wrote to you on the subject of St. Mary's two years and a half since—and my difficulty has not diminished in the interval. The question is, as you know, about my resigning the Living, but I am so bewildered that I don't know right from wrong, and have no confidence of being real in any thing I think or say.

My abiding difficulty in holding St. Mary's is the circumstance that the persons whom I am influencing are not my Parishioners, but the Undergraduates with whom I have no concern. It distresses me to think how little I am fitted for the charge of such a Parish, and how little I do—I dread to think the number of years I have been there, yet how unprofitably. On the other hand persons, who are not given me in charge, attend my Services and Sermons, and that certainly without, perhaps against, the wish of their proper guardians. If I felt this, as you know I did, before the No. 90 affair, how much more must I feel it since!

Another circumstance, which pressed on me painfully when I wrote to you before, was, that what influence I exert is simply and exactly, be it more or less, in the direction of the Church of Rome—and that whether I will or no. What men learn from me, who learn anything, is to lean

towards doctrines and practices which our Church does not sanction. There was a time when I tried to balance this by strong statements against Rome, which I suppose to a certain extent effected my object. But now, when I feel I can do this no more, how greatly is the embarrassment of my position increased! I am in danger of acting as a traitor to that system, to which I must profess attachment or I should not have the opportunity of acting at all.

But what increases my difficulty most heavily is the gradual advance, which is making, to a unanimous condemnation of No. 90 on the part of the Bishops. Here I stand on a different footing from all who agree to that Tract on the whole, even from you. No one but myself can be answerable for every word of it. The Bishops condemn it, without specifying *what* they condemn in it. This gives an opening to every reader who agrees with it on the whole, to escape the force of their censure. I alone cannot escape it. Two years have passed, and one Bishop after another has pronounced an unmitigated sentence against it. By October next the probability is, that hardly a single Bishop but will have given his voice against it; that is, given his voice against that comment on the Articles on which alone I can hold my Living. How can I with any comfort, with any sense of propriety, retain it? There is nothing said by them in mitigation of this sentence. My own Bishop says that by such expedients as the Tract exhibits I may make the Articles mean anything or nothing. The Bishop of Exeter I am told is quite violent in his language about me. The Bishop of St. David's, the most candid of all, says that the explanations which others have offered of the Tract just suffice to show that I need not be dishonest. And so on with the rest. I declare I wonder at myself that I have remained so long without moving. Now there *are* cases when a consciousness of being in the right suffices to outweigh the censure even of authority; but in this instance I cannot deny, first, that my interpretation has never been drawn out, to say the least, before—and I suspect our Catholic-minded Divines have rather

had recourse to the expedient of looking on the Articles as Articles of Peace—and next I am conscious too, as I have said above, that I am not advocating, that I am not promoting, the Anglican system of doctrine, but one very much more resembling in matter of fact, the doctrine of the Roman Church. I have nothing to *fall back* upon.

Another reason may be added which, though of very inferior importance, at least tells as far as this, to diminish the dread that, in retiring, I should be recklessly tossing away influence which Providence has put into my hands—occupation is growing on me of a different kind, and which is likely to interfere with my duties at St. Mary's—I mean, that of directing (as I best may) the consciences of persons. I very much doubt, whether I should not, by relinquishing St. Mary's, have a great deal more work than at present of a pastoral kind, and moreover of a directly *practical* nature, not strictly speaking theological.

The great objection to any such plan, (which I am not proposing even as an hypothesis before the Autumn), is lest it should seem to imply a great dissatisfaction with the Church of England; though really any sensible person ought to see that my situation fully justifies, if not calls for it. Pusey suggested, and I had thought myself, if it were determined on, that I might manage to retain Littlemore, which, I suppose, would be a sufficient answer to the suspicion. The College indeed, as you may recollect, refused to separate Littlemore from St. Mary's for such a purpose last October two years—but I think some arrangement of the kind might be managed. And then I might keep Littlemore on according to circumstances. I think my coming to live here, my occasional periods of absence from St. Mary's, which have now gone on for three years, and the continual rumours of my resigning it, have prepared people for such an event, over and above the Heads of Houses and the Bishops.

I am very sorry so to trouble you—but will you kindly bear my anxiety in mind? and the more that really I cannot say whether I feel a word of what I have written

and whether it is not all pretence. Of course there is no hurry for your answer; indeed from the nature of the case I do not wish a speedy one.

Ever yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. W. DODSWORTH

Littlemore: March 23, 1843.

I have been trying to make out, but in vain, whether the R. Catholics have a mission in the neighbourhood of Hong Kong. Probably not, as one generally hears of them about *Pekin*.

Yet it seems to me that this does not much alter the case, though it would make a better show in argument, if they had. I confess I must say, that I do not enter into this scheme of the Hong Kong mission; and that, upon the broad ground which you put, and which if not possessed of formal ecclesiastical force is at least free from the charge of technicality, that considering what the Roman Church has done (after all drawbacks and faults) in China, and what it has suffered, even to martyrdom, it is most inexpedient, with a view to the religious amelioration of the country, to interfere with its work. This seems to me a serious religious ground.

It is very unpleasant to be giving an opinion, which, as far as it goes, has a very much more practical bearing on you than on myself, since I do not expect our Bishop would be proposing any such measure as you expect in London, but, as my present opinion stands, I certainly could not myself take part in it—and therefore if he *does* propose it, I shall so far be in a worse position than you, that people would consider my declining to mean more.

But, after all, it is one of those perplexing matters, in which you may find yourself able ultimately to make up your mind to comply with the Bishop's wishes, even though they are not quite your own.

I think with you, that things must come to a crisis—

but do not see any symptoms of such a misfortune immediately. The Convocation, when it meets, will be a most anxious affair—and those Nestorian and Monophysite, not to say German, questions are full of hazard. By next autumn I suppose nearly all, or at least the great majority of the Bishops will have charged against No. 90. This is a serious matter to myself, but touches no one else. I wonder whether the Bishops think us made of squeezable materials (to use Mr. Hume's words) and that we have been using big words merely *in terrorem*.

Yours very sincerely,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. B. DALGAIRNS, Esq.

Littlemore: April 26, 1843.

Carissime,—The enclosed speaks for itself. I shall mention him in the office till May 22nd, i.e., for thirty days, which I think is the ecclesiastical time. We have now two Littlemore patrons (for so I think they have a right to be termed) taken from us—Froude and Wood—seven years between them (keep the letter for me or send it me back).

I have had to entertain a Durham man—a Mr. Skinner—who is writing a Scotch Hieroglyphy or the like, and is to work for us. His account of Durham is *wonderful*. In spite of Mr. Faber, Mr. Townshend, the Bp. (Maltby), the Dean (Waddington), both extreme liberals, in spite of Mr. Gilby and of Jenkyns, who considers Bishops not necessary for a Church, the men who turn out from the University, he says, have taken but one, and that a High Church course. He says that Jenkyns is regularly puzzled and annoyed. He has been preaching against various excesses, i.e., fasting. This Lent the University authorities were obliged to put up a notice ordering the men to attend dinner in Hall on Fridays. Mr. S. says that throughout the North, where he knows the country, the younger men are uniformly taking the high church line. Such news as this shows how wrong it is to be impatient. It is quite impossible such persons can stop where they are, i.e., unless

they marry, which reconciles one to any amount of intellectual inconsistency.

Lockhart has decided on going away on Monday next. Bowles is returned. I have not yet got from him any particulars, except that Dr. Maye certainly means to put him on a more generous regimen. Stewart talks of getting a course of English Eccles. History for £35, but he did not know of Cressy, and he seems contented with the old edition of Dugdale.

Miles has been in the *Record* for *dancing* at Malta. The Cistercian (or, as the *Record* says, the Sistercian) Bazaar has come off and fetched £800 to £1000.

Coffin is returned, and came up to see us all yesterday—he found none but Lockhart.

Mr. Mills has come back, and Henry is at a new novel for which he says Lockhart has furnished him with the scene and some striking points.

Ever yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

The following is Keble's answer to Newman's letter of March 14, and to another of later date which is missing. It is clear from Keble's reply that this latter one was about the 'Lives of the English Saints,' and contained a suggestion that Keble should write the Life of Bede.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

May 3, 1843.

My dearest and kindest Friend,—How can I ever thank you as I ought for your charitable remembrance of me, and I going on so long in such ungracious silence; and now I have to condole with you on another of your dearest friends being taken.<sup>1</sup> I hope you have not felt it too keenly: surely he was a person for whose departure it seems almost unkind to feel anything but thankful. Wilson tells me he was less uneasy after he got into Yorkshire among his friends. The rest of home, I suppose, was a sort of 'taste and say'<sup>2</sup> of the better Rest he was coming so near to.

<sup>1</sup> Samuel Wood, who died on April 22.

<sup>2</sup> The MS. has 'say'; probably, Dr. Lock suggests, intended as a provincialism for 'see.'

Now as concerning your two letters. I have turned the subject of your connexion with St. Mary's every way in my mind as well as I can ; and it seems to me that the time is come when there will be nothing wrong in your retiring, if your own feelings prompt you to do so, as of course they must on many accounts.

I am not sure that I should say this, if it involved your retiring from the exercise of the Ministry ; but, if you can manage to keep Littlemore, there will be no appearance of that kind, and you are yourself well able to judge whether the loss of your sermons from St. Mary's will not be compensated by your labours in giving private advice and hearing confessions. . . .

Then, it does seem to me that there has been a most encouraging silence, far more than could have been expected, in respect of the sort of retractation you made of certain phrases some months ago. I should have looked for a storm of obloquy, but, as far as I have heard, very little notice has been taken of it. I cannot help trusting that people are restrained in this instance, themselves know not how, and it gives one good hope that you will be allowed to go on quietly in what you judge, on the whole, your duty.

I am not sure that I ought not to follow your example, committed as I am to the very same principles ; only that I do not think so much of Bishops' words in their Charges as you do, and as I did myself, now that I have found out how they might act on them and do not, thereby proving themselves not in earnest. But without saying that it is your duty to retire, one may very well think that it is perfectly open to you to do so. Whichever way you resolve, I do not see that you can do very wrongly. . . .

Touching the Lives of Saints, you know how glad I should be to be useful, and I will try it at any rate, if you recommend me, though I do not feel as if I was up to it in any way. But I really fear I must ask for more time, and a good deal more : for I am most disgracefully ignorant, and have no books at hand. Is not his History in Saxon ? I do not know a word of Saxon.



I have been reading your Sermons, both Plain and University, and it is the next thing to talking with you at Littlemore and at Oxford. Is that Ward's Article in 'British Critic' about Confession? it seemed to me a very good one. Perceval was here yesterday, and said that W. Palmer of Magdalen had been writing another (what he called) violent pamphlet about the Bishop of Jerusalem. I never can understand why people call his writings so violent: they seem to me particularly calm. . . . I am seriously thinking of getting rid of the copyright of the 'Christian Year'; do you see any objection? would you alter certain passages first?

We are tolerably well here, and our woods are getting into high beauty. We kept Anfield Commemoration Friday week, and thought of you and others. Perceval told me he saw Pusey pretty well not long since; except this, I have not heard of him for a very long time. All kind Easter wishes to yourself, to him, Copeland and Marriott and Church and all such friends.

I am still sore about Arnold's memorial, but surely we were right.

We had Archdeacon Froude here the other day, and it was delightful to see him so well and heartwhole.

Ever your grateful and affectionate,

J. K.

In the following letters Newman makes Keble acquainted with the change which was coming over his religious opinions.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore: Thursday, May 4, 1843.

My dear Keble,—On this very day, on which I have received your kind letter, giving me conditional leave of retiring from St. Mary's, I have been disappointed in my last expedient for keeping Littlemore by itself. This circumstance, combined with the most kind tone of your letter,

has strongly urged me to tell you something which has at last been forced upon my full consciousness.

There is something about myself, which is no longer a secret to me—and if not to me, surely it ought not to be so to some one else ; and I think that other person should be you, whose advice I have always wished to follow.

I have enough consciousness in me of insincerity and double dealing, which I know you abhor, to doubt about the correctness of what I shall tell you of myself. I really cannot say whether I am stating my existing feelings, motives, and views fairly, and whether my memory will not play me false. I cannot hope but I shall seem inconsistent to you—and whether I am or have been I cannot say. I will but observe that it is very difficult to realize one's own views in certain cases, *at the time* of acting, which is implied in culpable inconsistency ; and difficult again, when conscious of them, to discriminate between passing thoughts and permanent impressions, particularly when they are unwelcome. Some thoughts are like hideous dreams, and we wake from them, and think they will never return ; and though they do return, we cannot be sure still that they are more than vague fancies ; and till one is so sure they are not, as to be afraid of concealing within what is at variance with one's professions, one does not like, or rather it is wrong, to mention them to another.

I do trust that I am not trifling with myself now, nor am about to say what is beyond my own settled impressions. If I am, it is most cruel to you in many ways. Any how, you will be undergoing a most dreadful suffering at my hands, if you read the other paper.

I do not feel distress at putting on you the *necessity of advising* ; because, so that you give your best judgment, it is all you can give, all that Divine Mercy expects from you or me ; and by acting honestly upon it, I shall, so be it, be pleasing Him, whatever comes of it ; but what shall I say for the *pain* I shall be causing you ?

Ever yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

Littlemore : May 4, 1843.

Oh forgive me, my dear Keble, and be merciful to me in a matter, in which, if I have not your compassion, my faith is so weak and I have so little sense of my own uprightness, that I shall have no refuge in the testimony of my conscience, such as St. Paul felt, and shall be unable to appeal from you to a higher judgment seat. But if you do on deliberation accuse me of insincerity, still tell me, for I shall deserve to bear it, and your reproof will be profitable.

In June and July 1839, near four years ago, I read the Monophysite Controversy, and it made a deep impression on me, which I was not able to shake off, that the Pope had a certain gift of infallibility, and that communion with the See of Rome was the divinely intended means of grace and illumination. I do not know how far I fully recognised this at the moment ; but towards the end of the same Long Vacation I considered attentively the Donatist history, and became quite excited. It broke upon me that we were in a state of schism. Since that, all history, particularly that of Arianism, has appeared to me in a new light ; confirmatory of the same doctrine.

In order to conquer this feeling, I wrote my article on the Catholicity of the English Church, as I have written other things since. For a while my mind was quieted ; but from that time to this the impression, though fading and reviving, has been on the whole becoming stronger and deeper.

At present, I fear, as far as I can realize my own convictions, I consider the Roman Catholic Communion the Church of the Apostles, and that what grace is among us (which, through God's mercy, is not little,) is extraordinary, and from the overflowings of His Dispensation.

I am very far *more* sure that England is in schism, than that the Roman additions to the Primitive Creed may not be developments, arising out of a keen and vivid realizing of the Divine Depositum of faith.

All this is so shocking to say, that I do not know whether to wish that I am exaggerating to you my feelings or not.

You will now understand what gives edge to the Bishops' charges, without any undue sensitiveness on my part. They distress me in two ways ; 1. as being in some sense protests and witnesses to my conscience against my secret unfaithfulness to the English Church ; and 2. next, as being average samples of her teaching and tokens how very far she is from even aspiring to Catholicity.

I must add that Rogers, who has known, perhaps better than any one, my opinions and their history, has for two years past peremptorily refused to give me any advice whatever on Church matters, one way or the other ; and has *within the last month* told me his reason ; viz. that it would be treachery in him to the English Church, to assist one who is conducting a movement, tending to carry over her members to Rome.

Of course the being unfaithful to a trust is my great subject of dread, as it has long been, as you know. Still there is another alternative, besides that of carrying members of our Church to Rome, viz. disposing *herself* that way, and so healing a schism instead of making one. Yet, all this being considered, it does seem to me *safer* to retire from a post, in which, whether I will or no, I may be employing a sacred authority committed to me against the giver.

However, this is the point which I am submitting to your judgment. What ought I to *do* ?

Whatever pain I may have on many accounts in giving up Littlemore, and that to a person like Eden, and great as the loss of Copeland would be to the Parish, I hope that on the whole things would go on pretty much as usual. And I cannot wish to be without personal pain or inconvenience in taking a step of this kind.

Ever yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

It must have been a few days after the frank explanation alluded to in the previous letter that Rogers wrote as follows to Newman :

Temple • April 3, 1843.

<sup>1</sup> My dear Newman,—I do not like meeting you again without having said, once for all, what I hope you will not think hollow or false. I cannot disguise from myself how very improbable—perhaps impossible—a recurrence to our former terms is. But I wish, before the time has past for such an acknowledgment, to have said how deeply and painfully I feel—and I may say have more or less felt for *years*—the greatness of what I am losing, and to thank you for all you have done and been to me. I know that it is in a great measure by my own act that I am losing this, and I cannot persuade myself that I am substantially wrong, or that I could long have avoided what has happened. But I *do* believe, if I may dare say so, that God would have found a way to preserve to me so great a blessing as your friendship if I had been less unworthy of it. I *do* feel most earnestly how much of anything which I may venture to be thankful for in what I am is of your forming—how more than kind—how tender you have always been to me, and how unlikely it is that I can ever again meet with anything approaching in value to the intimacy which you gave me . . . I should have been pained at leaving all this unsaid. But I do not write it with an idea of forcing an answer from you—nor does it require one—and I shall not attach any meaning to your leaving it unanswered.

Yours affectionately,

FREDERIC ROGERS.

The hyper-sensitive Newman of fiction ought to have broken entirely with Rogers. The real Newman did nothing of the kind. And Mr. Rogers, on his side, had within less than two years the opportunity of giving public testimony to the fact that his love for Newman had not diminished one whit. It was on the occasion when in the beginning of 1845 a gratuitous attempt was made to get Convocation to censure Tract 90. This is part of what he said : ' When they see the person whom they have been accustomed to revere as few men are revered, whose labours, whose greatness,

<sup>1</sup> This letter has already been published in the *Letters of Lord Blackford* (London, Murray, 1896), p. 110, but the temptation to quote it is irresistible.

whose tenderness, whose singleness of purpose, they have been permitted to know intimately . . . when they contrast his merits . . . with the merits, the bearing, the fortunes of those who are doggedly pursuing him, it does become very difficult to speak without sullyng what it is a kind of pleasure to feel is *his* cause by using hard words, or betraying it by not using them.<sup>1</sup>

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore : May 10, 1843.

My dear Keble,—I named *Bede* first, thinking that it would be a work for which his own writings would be everything, since so little of him is otherwise known. And thus you would not need a public library. Perhaps I was wrong in mentioning Alcuin also—as the subject would be excursive. But do as you will. If you do not take Alcuin and the schools, I shall offer the subject to Brewer, or Haddan.

Of course I could not but be long prepared for Wood's being taken from us. He has been failing for two years. He has been here several times—the last time in October. It was on his encouragement, or rather suggestion, that I took this building in hand, two years next Whitsuntide. Thank you for your kind anxiety.

Ward has had a good deal to do with the article you speak of, but did not write it. The author, I don't know why, wishes to be secret.

Bowden is in Oxford with his son and brother, and seems very well.

Pusey is laid up with a sort of fever—he got up yesterday at 12, which was an improvement. I sat with him an hour on Sunday, he lying on the sofa. He seemed in very good spirits.

Ever yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

May 14, 1843.

Believe me, my very dear Newman, that any thought

<sup>1</sup> Quoted in Church's *Oxford Movement*, pp. 383-4.

of wilful insincerity in you can find no place in my mind. You have been and are in a most difficult position, and I seem to myself in some degree able to enter into your difficulties : and, although one sees of course how an enemy might misrepresent your continuing in the English Priesthood with such an impression on your mind, I have no thought but of love and esteem and regard and gratitude for you in this as in everything. . . . I can only just say what I feel, perfectly unequal as I know myself on every account to give you advice on this awful matter. My feeling is

1. That your withdrawing from the English ministry under the present circumstances will be a very perilous step, not so much in itself, but because of its bringing you, as I fear it would, in every respect nearer what I must call the temptation of going over.

2. That this latter would indeed be a grievous event, considering that for what is wrong without our fault in the place where God's Providence has set us, we are not ourselves answerable, but we are for what may be wrong in the position we choose for ourselves.

3. That this difference in point of responsibility ought in a matter of practice to outweigh the difference you feel on the other side in the evidence *for* the claims of Rome and against her additions to the Creed. Especially as

4. You seem to ground your impression chiefly on points of *historical* evidence : you speak of it as of a ' hideous dream,' from which you would gladly awake : it does not overpower you with a sort of intrinsic lustre, as many divine truths, I suppose, might.

5. You speak in one part of your letter of our Church showing no signs of repentance, no yearning after Catholicity : but is not the time too short for any one to be acting on this impression ? Certainly there is a great yearning even after Rome in many parts of the Church, which seems to be accompanied with so much good, that one hopes, if it be right, it will be allowed to gain strength. But from Bishops one could hardly look at present for more than toleration, and that I consider myself to have from my Diocesan,

much more you from yours. Are you sure that some of your feeling on this head is not owing to a natural reaction from having had too eager expectations at some time ?

6. I am not sure how far it is right to talk of consequences, but I suppose, as far as we can judge of them, that no one thing would tend more entirely to throw us back and undo what little good may have been done of late. As to the question itself I am really too ignorant of the parts of history to which you refer to say a word : but can it be that the evidence seems so overpowering as to amount to moral certainty ? and if not, ought not but a small probability on the other side to weigh against it practically ?

You see my deep feeling about your withdrawing from your ministerial place refers almost wholly to what I fear might come after : if I were secure against such consequences, I cannot say that I should think it wrong, great as the alarm would perhaps be for a time, and the loss too in many respects.

One thing occurs to me ; do you not think it possible that you may have over-estimated the claims of Rome in your later studies from a kind of feeling that your earlier expressions had done her wrong ? and now that you have retracted them, would it not be well to examine the matter over again, free as you would be from that particular bias ?

And now, my dearest Newman, I have one most earnest request to make of you, that you will not in the smallest degree depend on my advice or opinion in this matter, for you do not, you cannot . . . in every respect but true love (I believe) towards you. It frightens me to think how rashly and with how small preparation I have been dealing with these great matters, and I have all manner of imaginations as to how my defects may have helped to unsettle people, and in particular to hinder you from finding peace. Yet do not suppose I would stop you from writing to me, if it is the least relief to you to do so. On the contrary not to hear from you would be a sad loss. All I want is that you should put no sort of implicit faith in me, but take up



with what I say when you see anything in it that is reasonable and right, not otherwise.

I still cling to the hope you taught me to entertain, that, in the present distress, where the Succession and the Creeds are, there is the Covenant, even without visible intercommunion.

God forgive and bless us, and choose our burthen for us, and help us to bear it : and, if it be His Will, may we too never be divided in Communion.

Ever your most grateful and affectionate,

J. KEBLE.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore : May 18, 1843.

My dear Keble,—Thank you for your speedy as well as compassionate letter. I feel it to be almost ungenerous to entangle you in my troubles ; at least it would be so, were it not a rule of the Gospel that Christians should not stand alone or depend on themselves. And, if so, to whom can I go, (for surely I may so speak without irreverence) but to you who have been an instrument of good to so many, myself inclusive ? To whom is it natural for me to go but to you whom I have tried to follow so long and on so many occasions ? to whom would Hurrell go, or wish me to go but to you ? And doubt not that, if such is the will of Providence, you will in the main be able to do what is put on you.

I feel no doubt that in consulting you I am doing God's will ; for, since I lay claim to no such infallible perception of His leadings, as may be granted to some, and as would oblige me to follow it, the alternative lies between selfwill and consulting you.

Yet, after saying this, still I know that some questions in detail to which I am coming, are so very intricate, that it will not at all surprise me to find you decline them. Only then answer as much as you like ; and I will take your answers as far as they go.

But first, in answer to some suggestions you make, I

will briefly say ; 1. that by a ' hideous dream ' I meant, what surely is hideous, to begin to suspect oneself external to the Catholic Church, having publicly, earnestly, frequently, insisted on the ordinary necessity of being within it. 2. I do not think I have ever been sanguine of success *in my day* or at all. The ' Lyra,' and the beginning of my Letter to Faussett, will, I think, show that. It is true, however, that I have spoken very confidently about our being in no danger from Rome ; and I doubt not with much presumption and recklessness. But I had a full conviction, (and have still) of the independence of the Anglican view compared with the Roman, and the formidableness of the former to the latter, and I had great faith in our Divines, so as to take (I suppose) for granted, what I had not duly examined, the irrelevancy of the charge of schism as urged against us. If I have been very bold in *nearing* the Roman system, this has risen mainly from over-secure reliance on our position, and from a keen impression of our great need of what the Roman system contains. I have spoken strongly against that system itself, that I might use it without peril. 3. Re-actions are, I suppose, sudden ; strong opposite impulses occurring in immediate succession ; but my present feelings have arisen naturally and gradually, and have been resisted. It is true, that I have now laid down my arms rather suddenly. This was caused, I believe, by Rogers' note, which I opened a few hours after writing to you on Easter Eve, and by Eden's avowal to me the other day, that, were he Vicar of St. Mary's, he would not engage even to let me read daily prayers at Littlemore, though he did not provide any one else. But though I have been thrown upon telling you, I hardly know how, yet I do not think I have said anything to you beyond the fact ; and surely when a misery is of so long standing, anyhow you should know it.

And now I come to the main subject of my letter.

I would ask, whether I should not be sufficiently kept in order, as you desire, by retaining a Fellowship, and the Editorship of the ' Library of the Fathers,' though I had not a living.

On the other hand, contemplate the great irritation of mind to which St. Mary's exposes me continually.

I do not think I could take the Oath of Supremacy again, though I quite know that there are fair and almost authorized modes of undertaking<sup>1</sup> it in a Catholic sense; but, considering my opinions and the opinions of the mass of Churchmen *on the whole*, I do not think it would be safe to do so. Now then, am not I exposing myself to a constant risk of detection, considering too the number of eyes, friendly and hostile, which are upon me? (I take this Oath as a mere illustration of many things, which in fact would press more heavily upon a beneficed Clergyman than a Fellow.) A detection would be far more calamitous, than a quiet withdrawal while things were so tranquil. Might I not fairly assign the Bishops' Charges as the reason of it? For surely I should feel no anxiety at all about treachery to the Church, if they, as organs of prevailing opinion as well as Bishops, had one and all *approved* and *recommended* No. 90, instead of censuring it.

My office or charge at St. Mary's is not a mere *state* (though that would be painful enough) but a continual energy. People assume, and exact, certain things of me in consequence.

With what sort of sincerity can I obey the Bishop? How am I to act in the frequent cases in which in one way or other the Church of Rome comes into consideration? I have, to the utmost of my power and with some success, tried to keep persons from Rome, but even a year and a half since my arguments were of that nature, as, though efficacious with the men aimed at and they only, to infuse suspicions of me in the minds of lookers-on.

By retaining St. Mary's, I am an offence and stumbling block. Persons are keen-sighted enough to make out what I think on certain points, and then they infer that such opinions are compatible with holding situations of trust in the Church. This is a very great evil in matter of fact. A number of younger men take the validity of their interpretation of the Articles etc. from me *on faith*. Is not my

<sup>1</sup> Al. 'Understanding.'

present position a cruelty to them, as well as a treachery towards the Church ?

I do not see how I can either preach or publish again, while I hold St. Mary's, but consider the following difficulty in such a resolution, which I must state at some length.

Last Long Vacation the idea suggested itself to me of publishing the 'Lives of the Saints,' and I had a conversation with Rivington about it. I thought that it would be useful, as employing the minds of persons who were in danger of running wild, and bringing them from doctrine to history, from speculation to fact ; again, as giving them an interest in the English soil and English Church, and keeping them from seeking sympathy in Rome as she is ; and further, as tending to promote the spread of right views.

But within the last month it has come upon me, that, if the scheme go on, it will be a practical carrying out of No. 90, from the character of the usages and opinions of Antereformation times.

It is easy to say 'Why *will* you be doing *any* thing ? (A note has suddenly come to me from Pusey which I will transcribe, though it will give you additional pain.) why *won't* you keep quiet and let things alone ? what business had you to think of any such plan at all ?' But I *cannot* leave a number of poor fellows in the lurch ; I am bound to do the best for a great number of people both in Oxford and elsewhere. If I did not act, others would find means to do so. Again is Mr. Taylor, etc. to abuse the Saints, and no one to defend them ? But this is off the subject.

Well, the plan has been taken up with great eagerness and interest. Many men are setting to work. I set down the names of men, who are most of them engaged, the rest half engaged or probable ; some writing. Bowden, Johnson (Observatory), Church, Haddan, Oakeley, Tickell (Univ.), Lewis, J. Mozley, Stanley (perhaps), Lake, Macmullen, Faber (Univ.) Brewer, Coffin, Dalgairns, Ashworth, T. Ryder, Pattison, A. Christie, Pritchard (Balliol) Ormsby (Lincoln) Bridges (Oriël) Lockhart (Exeter) Harris (Magdalen) Barrow (Queen's) Meyrick (C.C.C.), Chretien (Oriël), Murray (Ch. Ch.), Collings (Ch. Ch.), etc.

The plan has gone so far that it would create much surprise and talk, were it now suddenly given over. Church, whom I asked, agrees in this. Yet how is it compatible with my holding St. Mary's, being what I am? On the other hand, is not such an engagement in itself a sort of guarantee in addition to the Editorship of the 'Library of the Fathers' and my Fellowship, of my remaining quiet, though I did not retain St. Mary's for that purpose.

I have had another plan of a series of Devotional Works, but of this I will speak at another time.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. N.

My dear K,—I have in the midst of my writing received a note from Pusey which I transcribe, with *his* note to me.

All I know of it is, that P. after having had a fever for ten days and being nearly the whole of the time confined to his bed, preached a Sermon last Sunday, (which doubtless he had written before) on the Holy Eucharist as a means of remission of sins. *This is all I have heard about it.*

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. N.

P.S.—Keep it quite secret.

The letter from Pusey was about the proceedings which were to be taken against him on account of his sermon on the Holy Eucharist.

The incident alluded to in the following letter is thus described in the 'Life of Pusey.'<sup>1</sup> 'On Ascension Day, May 25, the Rev. T. E. Morris, Student and Tutor of Christ Church, preached before the University by the Dean's appointment. In his sermon he had spoken of "Laud the martyred Archbishop who, let us trust, still intercedes for this Church." On the following day the Vice-Chancellor sent for the sermon "under the provisions of the Statute Tit. xvi, § II."<sup>2</sup> Mr. Morris sent the sermon together with extracts from Anglican divines illustrating his language. On the following Wednesday the Vice-Chancellor informed Mr. Morris that all the notice he had to take *officially* of the sermon was to require that Mr. Morris would *ex animo*

<sup>1</sup> II. 337.

<sup>2</sup> The same Statute which was being put into force against Pusey.

express his assent to the Twenty-second Article ; a request which was apparently based on the presumption that it is impossible to believe in the intercession of the Saints without invoking them. Mr. Morris of course had no difficulty in complying with the Vice-Chancellor's desire ; he " did not see that what he had said involved Invocation [of the Saints] at all." Here the matter ended. This incident probably inspired the scene in Chap. X of ' Loss and Gain,' where the hero Charles Reding makes the same distinction between Invocation and Intercession. But he does not get off so easily as Mr. Morris. He is accused of sheltering himself under ' a subtle distinction ' and is informed that the terms are ' correlative.'

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

May 29, 1843.

My dear Keble,—T. Morris of Ch. Ch. has been taken to for his Sermon at Ch. Ch. on Ascension Day for the Dean. I inclose what will throw light on the state of the case. We think it a very bad move of the Heads. And the V.C. is getting frightened—and told Morris he was against it. Also he is veering round about Pusey. And he told M. he meant to be impartial, and receive charges on the other side.

Sewell is cast off by the Quarterly, and appears holding out signals of distress and flags of truce to us.

George Denison has been very urgent with us here to get up a Protest against the uneclesiastical clauses of the Factory Bill—a subject on which he is full of fury. I told him nothing would be done.

A stranger has given us two antique red granite columns to make ornaments of for the altar screen and altar at Littlemore—and another (anonymous) person £200 for the same purpose. Also we are going to new bench the Chapels. And we have had a new (finger) organ built and given us by an Undergraduate.

Ever yours affectionately

J. H.

P.S.—Lucy Pusey is getting well. Pusey is much better though hardly off his sofa. No news about his Sermon beyond what I have said above.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

May 30, 1843.

My dear Newman,—I have delayed writing too long, but I believe it was in the hope of being able to see our way more clearly and so being of more use to you. I fear I am not worthy to be so made useful; but I will say as well as I can what seems best to me now.

It seems to me that, supposing a person to have *no doubt at all* of the schismaticalness of the body he belongs to, (e.g. to be as sure of it as one is of Episcopacy) and that impression to continue after long, honest and self-denying endeavours to get rid of it, accompanied of course by conscientiousness in other parts of duty—that he could not well go on exercising a trust committed to him by that body, every act of which would seem to imply that he does not consider itself in schism.

But if he has still *any* doubt, I should then think he might go on, though in fear and trembling, yet without sin. I say, he *might* go on; but whether he *ought* to do so is quite another question, to be determined (among other very many things) by the degree of temptation and offence, to which he finds himself exposed: and that again not simply, but as compared with what he may reasonably foresee will beset him on his change of position.

I cannot yet bring myself to think that you are *quite* so clear as I have described above, in your view of our state; and, that being so, I might imagine that you might go on as you are without sin; but I really do think the position so very difficult a one, that I dare not press your retaining St. Mary's: it does seem to involve such constant peril of sin, and I feel that I should myself be quite unequal to it, and should perhaps be continually liable to be urged into some sudden step, by the sort of calls, often sudden ones, which the situation brings with it.

You see therefore that on the whole my leaning is towards your retiring as quietly as you can. . . .

I think those to whose opinion I should myself most

defer would say that a person of such great mental activity as yours had of course need to be on his guard from the very circumstance of that activity. There is a tendency to be always going on to something further which may be abused, and one always waiting to abuse it : and in *this* sort of sense I dare say you *do* very often say to yourself, ' Why can't you be quiet and let things alone ? ' but I do not see that this caution is inconsistent with such an undertaking as your ' Lives of the English Saints,' provided that it be *bona fide* made as practical as possible, and as dutiful to our present engagements. For my own part, as I still hope that we are not entirely cut off from the Church, and that such a plan tends to strengthen that which remains and is ready to die, I do not feel that I should be at all undutiful in acting with you in this or in any like plan, if I can but be up to it in other respects, especially as you yourself allow that, if the tone of the Bishops, etc. was favourable to No. 90 instead of adverse, you should not think yourself guilty of any breach of trust in remaining. And I am not prepared to give so much weight as you seem to do to the *un-enacted* leanings and tendencies of a particular generation. Formal decisions are in my mind the providential indications for ordinary persons in such perplexities, and until such are produced, against me, I shall, as at present advised, uphold No. 90 as sufficiently Anglican. It is true I have strong and evident temptations to deceive myself in this matter, more than you and others ; and I do not pretend to say I am comfortable, what right have I to be so ? but one can but do as seems best, and say God forgive me.

I shall be very anxious to hear how Pusey's matter goes on. If the statements I see in the *Times* of the tenor of his Sermon be correct, I think they will hardly dare to decide against him ; or, if they do, the clergy very generally will feel with him, as they did with P. Young. I fear Lucy is very ill ; should you write again will you mention her ?

Ever your affectionate and thankful,

J. K.



J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Saturday, June 3.

My dear Keble,—They have suspended Pusey from preaching for two years. He is making a Protest, which will be in the Common Rooms to-day. His Sermon will be published in a day or two.

Many thanks for your letter. I shall put aside the subject now for some time. If any thing strikes you that it would be consistent in me to do, or not do, under such circumstances as to my behaviour, habits, etc., I wish you would tell me.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. N.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. W. DODSWORTH

Sunday, June 4, 1843.

My dear Dodsworth,—It is very desirable that there should be some demonstration in favour of Pusey; if one thing after another is done against the holders of Catholic doctrines, without protest from any quarter, the imaginations of certain persons will be gradually affected with the notion that the Church of England does not hold them, and is not their place. And they will look for a place elsewhere. This, I have great cause to say, will be the effect of a series of such acts.

I hope that there will be some protest in Oxford against the *mode* in which the present act has been done *under the Statute*, which will answer the purpose of a defence of the doctrine impugned by the six doctors.

The difficulty of your doing anything in London is very great, considering any protest on Pusey's side would probably elicit a stronger demonstration on the side of his opponents.

I suppose the Bishop of London could not be induced to ask or to allow Pusey to preach in the London Diocese? What a mistake it is in the Bishops to suppose that silence is neutrality! If they do nothing, they side against him.

You will be glad to know that Pusey does not seem put out or annoyed by this matter. He has been treated most unworthily. His judges have made him correspond with them under a promise he will not tell what they say or he says. This is even going on *now*. He had four full pages from the Vice-Chancellor last night, of which he did not tell me even the receipt. They are already bringing the circumstances of this correspondence against his assertion that he has had no hearing—and his promise of secrecy hinders him explaining.

Yours very truly,  
JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—The Sermon is to appear forthwith.

J. H. NEWMAN TO E. L. BADELEY, Esq.

June 11, 1843.

Dear Badeley,—I enclose you a note I had from Pusey. He has given me leave. I think it will let you into his feelings. Do you not think he should put himself entirely into the hands of his friends?

You lawyers in London will be best able to judge whether he is in any inconsistency. The very anxiety which persons like myself feel about it incapacitates us for doing so. Of course if his proposed explanation is obscure, (which I think it is) he can be applied to for further information.

I have been thinking over what R. Palmer has just now said to me, and I think on the whole your meeting should be *before* not *after* the publication of the Sermon. Allow there are timid men who will attend, you are taking them at no disadvantage, nor will they retract afterwards. Seeing the Sermon has been condemned, to say nothing of Pusey's known tone of divinity, they must already have a suspicion it contains strong doctrine.

I think Pusey's Sermon *must* come out—how long after your London meeting?

Yours most sincerely,  
JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO E. L. BADELEY, Esq.

Oriel College : June 18, 1843.

My dear Badeley,—I fear it has seemed inconsiderate in me not writing to you, but at first I had nothing to say. Thank you much for the pains you took to write to me—and now I can hardly collect my wits.

Pusey is much perplexed what to write, and it is very difficult to put his mind in the position in which you see things. He has shown me your last letter to him, in which you write on the subject of a *second* Protest [written above as an alternative word 'explanation'] which he has sent you; and I like what you say very much. One other point I think he might bring out, viz., that all that went on in private was for the sake of making him *recant*, not *explain*.

He wishes to get the Vice-Chancellor to agree with him in certain propositions which he may put out—such as that he had not a hearing—that he was not asked to explain etc.—but first I dread having more private dealings with the Vice Ch.—and next the Vice Ch. will say, 'I cannot unless you retract this or that part of your Protest.' And if he even did, those pamphlets and articles in newspapers, which have gone on those certain parts of his Protest, will not like to be left in the lurch.

I really do not see how he can avoid the fullest details, when suspicion is once awakened, and the strength of his case, or rather the weakness of the Vice Ch.'s, lies in details—e.g. the very strong recommendation made him not to keep copies of his letters. However, this private account he cannot give without possessing the said letters—accordingly I have been urging him strongly to ask the Vice Ch. for them.

He thinks you are against details. I do not profess to have a view, indeed I am not in the way of hearing what people say enough to have one, but I should have thought he must at once draw out boldly the main facts of the case which are in his favor, and also go into detail.

As to the expressions in his Protest which seem not to agree with his further Explanation, he is so unwell, and has

been so anxious, that I do not like to press him—but I suspect he condescended over his protest *before* the Sentence was brought him, i.e., before the private communications—and then did see that it was in fact modified by those communications—nay he does not feel it even now—he says that those communications were ‘an utter nothing,’ ‘a mockery’—and do not interfere with the substantial and real accuracy of the statements in his Protest.

Persons here are getting your London Protest reprinted and sending it about the country. People call it milk and water, but you have said in it as much as you dare.

Yours most sincerely,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. AMBROSE ST. JOHN

Littlemore: June 20, 1843.

My dear St. John,—I dare say you think I ought to feel ashamed for not answering your first kind letter—but if you knew me better (or *when*, as I hope I may say) you will pity my right wrist and fingers which through continual weariness, for some years have been degenerating my writing, never of very ambitious excellence, to the level of your worthy Rector's.

I return the very pleasing letter you have permitted me to read. What a sad thing it is that it should be a plain duty to restrain one's sympathies, and to keep them from boiling over—but I suppose it is a matter of common prudence. I am very glad there is so good a chance of your hearing something about St. Simon.<sup>1</sup>

The Library at Littlemore is very much obliged to you for the accession you propose to make it. But let us take charge of it, till you have a place for it somewhere yourself. If you send the volumes to Stewarts', King William Street, they will make their way hither some time or other.

Things are very serious here, but I should not like you to say so, as it might do no good. The Authorities find that by the Statutes they have more than military power—

<sup>1</sup> Somebody, perhaps St. John, has added the ‘Stock.’

and the general impression seems to be that they intend to exert it and put down Catholicism at any risk. I believe that by the Statutes they can pretty well suspend a preacher as *seditiosus*, or causing dissension, without assigning their grounds in the particular cases—may banish him, or imprison him. If so all holders of preferment in the University should make as quiet an exit as they can. There is such exasperation on both sides at this moment, as I am told, than ever there was. And I fear some entanglement has taken place between Pusey and the Heads. An address is going about for which you should get as many signatures as you can—it is very important.

The title of the French Book is 'Œuvres de Tronson, Examens Particuliers, Paris 1823.' I have the 'Memorial of a Christian Life . . . written in Spanish R. F. Lewis de Granada . . . translated The first Part—London 1688.' If what you have met with is distinct from this, it will be very welcome. It contains four of the seven books.

The fraternity here, as you call us, unite in kind wishes to (may I use the word in its other sense?) *Fraternitati vestrae*. Anderdon is coming here to-day to take your place in the little room. Mind, there is room for both of you at any time—for we have expanded.

My kind remembrance to West.

Yours very sincerely,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. W. DODSWORTH

Littlemore: June 28, 1843.

My dear Dodsworth,—Pusey has left Oxford for Pusey, and Dr. Wootten (I am told) thinks him better. I confess I have been very uneasy about him—but more in prospect than from anything I saw at present. I have not said all I felt to more than one person, and that at a distance, who wrote to me.

He has had a low fever on him these eight weeks—and

has made little or no progress. Now that was just the way his little boy was taken four years ago. The little fellow lay in bed a long while and no one could tell what was coming, when the complaint seemed to determine upon his lungs—then on other organs—and ended in the present sad breakage of his health.

What has made me more anxious, however, in prospect is what I recollect of Pusey years ago. I think his life for 9 or 10 years has lain in the excitement of an *object*, or in a sanguine imagination about the state of things, and I should very much dread a change to despondency. Ten or eleven years ago he was in such a state; said his usefulness was at an end, that he was near death etc. From this state he was roused by the movement, and his health improved strangely. Ever since his one characteristic, contrasted with almost everyone else, has been his sanguine view of things.

He is now (Copeland tells me) as sanguine as ever. I see no sign of his becoming otherwise—but the *prospect* of such a change has made me very anxious. Hitherto he has all his life (I may say) been in authority—and at the head of a department, e.g. Hebrew. Now he is suddenly, or might feel himself to be, cast out of his position. Hitherto he has been to the bottom of his heart a conservative—but what would be his view of things when he found himself in opposition? This is the sort of question I have been asking myself, and perhaps more from anxiety than good grounds.

I hope change of air and scene will do everything for him that we can wish. His Sermon is now off his hands. I suppose it is *very important* that the Non-resident Address should be largely signed, about which I somewhat despair—but this is not in your way. I do not see what else can be done.

I am, my dear Dodsworth,

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

The following letter is of considerable interest, for it represents what was going on in many minds. In the early days of the Oxford Movement, Newman was fond of dwelling upon its spontaneous character. Catholic ideas were in the air, and seemed to spring up almost simultaneously in men's minds. In a word, the Movement was 'the result of causes far deeper than political or other visible agencies.'<sup>1</sup> Perhaps he exaggerated this feature of the original Movement, through his repugnance to think of himself as a leader. But the Movement within the Movement, the rise of the new school with its 'Romanising' tendencies, seems unquestionably to have been a spontaneous growth. This is how one of its most prominent members described it in after years:

'Of all popular errors on the subject of the Oxford controversy, none is more palpable than that which supposes a kind of confederacy, or premeditated union, among those who ultimately ended in becoming Catholics. We had one and all our individual peculiarities which, like so many sharp edges, stood in the way of anything like effectual combination. Hence, on many important questions, we were found on different sides. We had all our separate occupations, interests, and sets; and when the various persons who are popularly identified with Oxford opinions met together in company, there was an uncertainty of sympathy, and a dread of collision, which operated any wise rather than favourably upon intercourse, and threw many of the sincerest friends of those opinions upon societies, in which if there were less scope for enthusiasm, there was also less danger of differences.'<sup>2</sup>

The following letter from Ambrose St. John to Newman marks the beginning of the friendship immortalised in the concluding words of the 'Apologia.' It also illustrates the kind of isolation in which the men of the new school formed their views. The writer apparently owed his opinions to no one but himself. He was in advance of Newman before he came to know him, and went to Littlemore, not to be led forward, but to be held back.

<sup>1</sup> 'Prospects of the Anglican Church,' p. 272 (*Essays Crit. and Hist.* vol. i.).

<sup>2</sup> Oakeley, *Popular Lectures*, ii. pp. 6, 7.

REV. AMBROSE ST. JOHN TO J. H. NEWMAN

July 13, 1843.

My dear Newman,—I have never thanked you for your kind letter. . . . I have already stayed here longer than I thought I should, and I believe I shall still be here a week or ten days more, as there are some candidates for Confirmation whom I have been endeavouring to prepare since I have been here, and West wishes me to continue them until the Bishop comes. Until lately, when my mind has been taken up with other things, I have been trying to see what I ought to do when I leave this temporary duty here. Of course one chief thing my mind runs upon is what I mentioned to you at Littlemore—whether my views of doctrine will permit me to sign the Articles. My feeling about them is, I believe, this. In words they do appear to condemn certain usages and modes of expressing doctrine which I fully and entirely believe to be permitted and sanctioned by GOD. I will instance two things, Transubstantiation and the Invocation of Saints. (1) As far as I can see, I believe the word Transubstantiation, as explained by the catechism of the council of Trent, to be the clear, perhaps the only way of expressing the doctrine of the Real Presence, and of avoiding erroneous views of consubstantiation or a presence in the believer alone and the like; but I believe the Church of England, when it condemns the use of this word, means something quite different by the word 'substance' from what the Church of Rome means, and I have no difficulty in rejecting such a view of Transubstantiation as that of which I believe the Church of England speaks. (2) I do entirely believe that it is the will of GOD that we should ask the Saints for their prayers, especially the Blessed Virgin. This has come to me very strongly, and I cannot doubt it. Yet I can easily conceive that this should be dangerous to individuals, and I can also conceive that the Church of England when condemning Invocation of the Saints means something that is wrong and idolatrous. Still, as there is never a hint anywhere that I know of in



any of our formularies that there is a right use of these words, Transubstantiation and Invocation, as well as a wrong one, I must, I think, look upon any direct unqualified condemnation of them as highly dangerous, and tending to keep men back from taking hold of the true doctrine of the Catholic Church. I fear that I am distressing you by speaking to you again on this subject, as I am aware you believe it your duty to say little upon them, but I do not mention my view with an intention of drawing forth an opinion from you as to the course a person is at liberty to take who holds such views, though I need not say how thankfully any advice or direction will be received. I mentioned my difficulties to Wilberforce, and he was very kind, as he always is, in desiring me to do just as I wished in accompanying him to East Farleigh or not, adding that he did not at all mind going there by himself for three or four months; but he expressed his unwillingness to enter upon the subject of the articles with me, as he felt his view of the Catholic Church to be different from mine. He thought what he should say would only perplex me. So my conclusion at present is to ask your permission to come to Littlemore, and reside there for about three months, perhaps for a longer time, and you will let me do, I hope, as other men do about τὰ ἀναγκαῖα. I had very little time for study before I took orders, and in consequence I have read very little indeed, so that leisure for reading is quite necessary for me. And in more serious matters I have much need to recollect myself . . . in the bustle of caring for others, preaching, and talking, all this is forgotten. One gains something perhaps from seeing the realities of life, but the impression is lost for want of time and inclination to meditate upon them. . . . Another thing I must ask you about, do you think a person feeling such perplexity about signing the Articles is at liberty to take temporary duty? Mr. Dyson wishes me to help him when I go from here. I have given no direct answer yet. I told Wilberforce I thought I should like it, as it was a very quiet place and among very nice people. But it must not be for long

—I trust you will not refuse to be troubled with my matters in addition to your other labours,

Yours very faithfully,  
AMBROSE ST. JOHN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. AMBROSE ST. JOHN

Oriel College: July 16, 1843.

My dear St. John,—I assure you that I feel with too much sympathy what you say. You need not be told that the whole subject of our position is a subject of anxiety to others besides yourself. It is no good my attempting to offer advice, when perhaps I might raise difficulties instead of removing them. It seems to me quite a case in which you should, as far as may be, make up your mind for yourself. Come to Littlemore by all means—we shall all rejoice in your company—and if quiet and retirement are able, as they very likely will be, to reconcile you to things as they are, you shall have your fill of them. How distressed poor Henry [Wilberforce] must be that he cannot offer to discuss with you! Knowing how he values you, I feel for him—but alas! he has his own position, and every one else has his own, and the misery of it is that no two of us have exactly the same.

It is very kind of you to be so frank and open with me as you are. But this is a time which throws together persons who feel alike.

May I without taking a liberty sign myself  
Yours affectionately,  
JOHN H. NEWMAN.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

July 29, 1843.

My dear Newman,—I have to-day got a long and kind letter from R. Palmer, in which, replying to a question of mine what he thought on the subject as a lawyer, he goes at length into the matter of what Pusey ought to do. I

think it worth while to send it to you, and you may show it to Pusey or not, as you think best. I do not send it to him straight for fear of worrying him, as I apprehend he is not yet strong at all. I shall be glad to know when any thing is decided, as I am not a little anxious about the matter.

You may well believe that I have been full of thoughts about you, the more in one sense that I feel so utterly helpless and unable to think of any thing which I can suggest as good for a person tried as you are, except what I am sure you have thought of long ago. Thus sometimes I think it would be good for one to withdraw as much as possible for a while from theological study and correspondence, and be as entirely taken up as ever you can with parochial concerns : but then I am met with the recollection that you may expect so soon to be separated from poor Littlemore.

Again, I think unreserved confidence in a some *really worthy* Confessor might be a great help to you at times : I mean the sort of submission which would make you put by a subject, if he bid you, without his assigning any reason.

And I suppose it may be well for one to watch and pray especially against the temptation of always being on the move, which I suppose is the portion of some minds.

I have been looking for the second time at your ' Essay on Ecclesiastical Miracles,' where you argue from the analogy of God's works, especially from the strangeness of certain animals, and it has occurred to me whether an objector might not plausibly say, ' We do not know how much of what shocks us in God's works may be owing to the intrusion of evil spirits since the fall, there being passages in Scripture which look that way ; and perhaps these Church Miracles may have the same origin.' Might not this be said ? and might it not properly have a distinct answer ?<sup>1</sup> Trusting to your constant remembrance,

Ever your affectionate,

J. K.

<sup>1</sup> (N.B.—But I have *also* referred to certain *Scripture* miracles, and certain histories as Samson's, as being in the same sense '*strange*.' J. H. N. June 24, 1878.)

## J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

August 3, 1843.

My dear K,—I have just received the enclosed from Palmer. I have asked his leave, should I doubt of any of his *facts*, to have recourse to your memory of the matters spoken of.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. N.

P.S.—I will answer your letter and inclosure. Thank you for it. Bowden has just come here, on his way (I grieve to say) to the continent to get rid of a cough which hangs about him. Else he seems very well.

## J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore: August 20, 1843.

My dear Keble,—Copeland has explained to you my silence hitherto; but to-day I stay here, instead of going to Oxford, and therefore can write—not to say that I have outrun Baxter, and sent off the Plain Sermons to G. and R.

You have been continually in my thoughts since your letters. As to the second, I wish I could say any thing to your purpose—and am very much afraid, from my unskilfulness and inconsiderateness, of saying a word. I think I feel that you should not ordinarily be under the influence of those painful feelings which you express—nor are you, as I trust—they belonged to the moment when you wrote, and do not represent your habitual state of mind. O my dear Keble, you know far better and more deeply than I, that 'the time is short'—and that the highest blessings are not earthly—nay, the highest are commonly purchased by a privation of the earthly. So at least it has been with those whom God loves best. If so, surely we ought not to feel too acutely the absence of such blessings, in the case of those we love best, as are not commonly allotted to the Saints, instead of wishing for them those which the Saints have ever received. I know I am writing only commonplaces—and if I attempt to go beyond them, I may only be showing

my ignorance and want of sympathy—and yet if I knew how, I think there is a way in which they might be made useful to you. You will so make them better than any one else, if they can be made.

As to your former letter I am very grateful to you for it. On the receipt of it I began next morning to keep a very minute journal of myself, which would do to show any one in confession and give him a sort of an idea of my present state. But then whom was I to ask to see it? I could think of no one but you—and I determined to ask you. So I went on till about the 10th of August, i.e. 10 days—when your second letter came, and made me feel that you had enough of anxiety already without my increasing it. It also struck me that after all it would not assist any one in advising me—but of that perhaps I am no judge.

I suppose you got your suggestion or guess about the advantage of *stopping me* short from time to time in what I might be doing, and making me change my employment arbitrarily, from reading my Sermon on Development, under the notion that I might be *watching the progress of things* or the like. I do not think this is the case. I am commonly very sluggish, and think it a simple bore or nuisance to have to move or to witness movements. My great fault is doing things in a mere literary way from the love of the work, without the thought of God's glory. But as to influencing people, making points, advancing and so on, I do not think these are matters which engross or engage or even interest me. Indeed considering how one is fettered by existing professions and by a sense of piety towards existing institutions, advance is, in itself, something very distressing.

If I were to have any thing more directly *practical* it should be an hospital. I fear the more parochial duty I took, the more I should realise, and the greater temptation I should be under to give up, our present defective system, which *seems* to be without the capabilities of improvement. I do not say this from theory about myself, but think I feel this effect in me.

If any thing strikes you to advise me, pray oblige me with it. I will send you the journal I spoke of, if you think it best.

Pusey seems quite well.

Ever yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—I forgot to add above that I am not at all my own master as to time, as it is. E.g. having to answer letters is an imperious external regulation of much of my time, breaking off my reading etc. perforce. Such in a measure too have the Plain Sermons been this year. I do not think I am attached to one kind of work more than another. What I dislike is *beginning any* work—and what I like is having a swing of it, when *in* it, which I very seldom get, but not from any thing that is to *come* of it, but either from love of the occupation, or desire to get it over.

I preached, going on for two years since, some Sermons on our position as a Church which had the effect of quieting some persons who felt unsettled as to Rome. Since that various men have asked for them to lend, and they have been useful in the same way. I have from the first been asked to publish them—but disliked to do so without taking time about them. I am inclined to do so now, making them part of a volume, to be called, not Parochial Sermons, but Sermons on subjects of the day, or the like title. Now I want to ask you in the first place, whether it would *be consistent* with my position to publish *altogether*; if you see an antecedent objection to it I will not do so—if you do not, then I will send you (please) one or two sermons, to have your opinion on them.

It has struck me that the fact of publishing Sermons just now would be a sort of guarantee to people that my resigning St. Mary's (to which I am more and more strongly drawn) did not involve an ulterior step—for no one could suppose that I should be publishing to-day, and leaving the Church to-morrow. (By the bye, though this is another question, something or other I must do in the way of assigning *a reason* for resigning, and I do not see any thing better than

to give what I feel very much. What I have implied as a reason years ago by anticipation, and have laid the ground of, viz., the Bishops having declared themselves so strongly against me personally. This has been brought home to me, by the great startling the announcement gave to a lady I do not know, whom I was obliged to tell. I thought I might append to Tract 90 what the Bishops had said.)

As to the Sermons, I believe the *main* reason with me for publishing, at least at present (I say at present because, as time goes, secondary reasons often become primary ones, and almost motives) is for the sake of those anti-Roman Sermons—but subordinately I suppose I wish (1) to commit to print a volume which I think will have good matter in it. (2) To receive the money which I shall get by it.

J. H. N.

August 21, 1843.

The volume of sermons contemplated in the above letter was eventually published under the title of 'Sermons on Subjects of the Day.' The Sermons about which he especially consulted Keble are marked off from the rest of the volume by a note of warning: 'The following four Sermons, on the safety of continuance in our communion, are not addressed, 1 either to those who happily are without doubts on the subject, 2 or to those who have no right to be in doubt about it.' The former should read them 'with the caution exercised in opening the works of a Christian Apologist, who is obliged to state painful objections, or to make extreme admissions, in the process of refuting his opponents.' As regards the latter class, 'Doubts are often the punishment of existing neglect of duty. Persons who make no effort after strictness of life,' who do not attempt 'to know themselves, correct their faults . . . to deny their wills, must not be surprised if they are unsettled and restless, and have no encouragement to seek an intellectual remedy for difficulties which may be assigned to grave moral deficiencies.'<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, p. 308 footnote. The titles of the four sermons are—(1) Invisible Presence of Christ; (2) Outward and Inward Notes of the Church; (3) Grounds for Steadfastness in our Religious Profession; (4) Elijah the Prophet of the Latter Days.

## REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

August 25, 1843.

I should think on the whole, that, unless you feel very strongly drawn towards showing me your journal, I had better not see it : your own feelings in such a matter must be the only criterion. It is curious that I too had thought whether hospital work, or something equivalent, would not be a good sort of thing for you. But He will, I trust, guide us, who has us in His hands.

The only objection to publishing, I suppose, would be, from a fear of being or seeming insincere ; and this again must depend on the nature of the Sermons. I can imagine them so contrived, as to tend towards obviating any possible risk of that kind ; and then it will be so much the more desirable for yourself and many others in various degrees to have them out. I am sure, I for one, should be very glad of them.

It seems to me that the history of No. 90 gives quite a sufficient reason for your resigning St. Mary's, without any occasion for people to surmise more ; and indeed, I dare say, most persons in your place would have done it before now.

I gather from a note of R. Palmer's this morning, that the Law proceedings will be embarrassed, as was feared, by Pusey's keeping no copy.

Ever yours most affectionately,

J. KEBLE.

## J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Friday, August 25.

My dear Keble,—I have just had a letter from Lockhart, one of my inmates, who has been away for three weeks, saying that he is on the point of joining the Church of Rome and is in retreat under Dr. Gentili of Loughborough.

Would *this* be a good excuse for giving up St. Mary's—will you turn it in your mind ?

You may fancy how sick this makes me.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. N.



REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

August 30, 1843.

I am most truly grieved on many accounts at what your note, received on Sunday, tells me. Among other things I am much afraid there has been some underhand unkind behaviour towards you. If so, bad as it is for the individual, it must strengthen the feeling of those who most sincerely shrink from changes of this sort.

I confess I do not quite see how it smoothes matters for your resignation. I should have thought the quieter things were at the moment, the better for that step; and therefore that this, causing alarm, would rather defer it. On the other hand it must help all candid people to enter into the difficulty of your position.

I only wish I could say, do, or write any thing that would do you half as much good, as you have done me.

I have a long letter from Palmer of Worcester, urging the necessity, on the part of other people, of some such protest against the 'B(ritish) C(ritic)' etc., as he is going to make himself. I shall very likely send it you before long with my answer (when I have written one) but I do not want to add to your trouble at present; and there is no violent hurry, I think.

Ever, dearest N.,

Your grateful and affectionate,

J.K.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore: August 31.

My dear Keble,—I have shillyshalled several days whether I should send you any sermons as specimens or not. This morning I determined not—since, several men, to whom I mentioned those which were against leaving our Church (and which they had heard or read), have been so urgent, that I send you two on different subjects. But unless you are very clear in favour of publishing, I shall think it safe not to do so.

As to my Journal, I wish you honestly to say whether you think that you will be able to advise me better by seeing it. If so, I will send it.

Ever yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—I have thought it no good going on seeing Palmer's pamphlet.<sup>1</sup>

### J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore : September 1, 1843.

My dear Keble,—I have just got your note. I am ready still to keep St. Mary's, if you think best—will you turn in your mind, however,

1. that a noise will be made at my resigning, *whenever* I resign. It seems to me a dream to wait for a quiet time. Will not resignation become *more* difficult every quarter of a year?

2. that L.'s affair gives a *reason* for my resigning—as being a very great scandal—so great is it, that, though I do not feel myself responsible, I do not know how I can hold up my head again while I have St. Mary's.

3. If it did for the moment alarm people, as if something were to come of my resigning which they did not know; yet a very little time would undeceive them.

Should you think it advisable for me to retain St. Mary's awhile, would you object to my trying to get some one to take my duty at Oxford *entirely*, i.e. sermons and all?

As to L. he was all but going over a year and a half ago, before I knew him. His friends got me to take him, by way of steadying him—and I made him promise, as a condition of his coming, that he would put aside all thought of change for three years. He has gone on very well—expressed himself several times as greatly rejoiced he had made the promise, though I saw in him no change of *opinion*; and set himself earnestly to improving the weak points of his

<sup>1</sup> W. Palmer of Worcester was printing his *Narrative of Events connected with the Publication of the Tracts for the Times*. He had some correspondence with Newman on the subject.

character. There could not be any one more in earnest and who under a strong system would work better or turn out better. He wanted something absolutely to take hold of him, and use him: he felt the Church of Rome could do this and nothing else. He had not any great ability; and whether from that or other cause he never could see that going to Rome was a great change, a change of religion. He said 'my vocation is to be a brother of charity, etc. therefore my vocation is in the Church of Rome.' He had improved so much in general since he had been here, that people had remarked upon it. Whenever he went away, he had taken pains, not to go where he might have found temptation, or at least to keep a strict guard over himself. About a month since he went away on a holiday home. His mother moving about, he has been doing the same. We all think he had no intention at all of any move in religion when he left. He went to Dr. Gentili at Loughborough, on his way to Lincolnshire (I believe). And he was fascinated almost at once. Dr. G. did not make any overtures whatever to him; and only admitted him, when (as *he* thought) his duty obliged him. He does not seem to have told him of his promise; and some how he quite put it aside, and he writes me word that he had a call so very strong that he felt he dare not disobey it. He has already engaged himself to enter on his Noviciate in the Order of Charity (Rosminian) of which Dr. G. is the head in England. He is decidedly the greatest prize I have heard of their making.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. N.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore: September 1, 1843.

My dear K.,—I am acting the part of Job's messengers to you *πῆμ' ἐπὶ πῆματι* but so it is, and sorry as I am to pain you, I feel it must be so.

A long journal or rather argument in the way of reflections has just been sent me of a person more considerable

than any who have hitherto gone over to Rome, and who has been unsettled for a considerable time—getting over his difficulties and then falling under them again.

It is very well and powerfully written, and with a good deal of feeling and show of conscientiousness.

The writer says that I have brought him to his present opinions, and therefore he wants me to stop him. He is disposed, and more than that, to obey me at this moment. There seems to me no doubt, however, he will ultimately secede. I state it, not to bias your judgement, but as evidence towards forming it, that my 4 sermons I think would be of use to him. *He* however, could *borrow* them.

I must confess, as seriously as I can, that his paper has moved me—but that is neither here nor there. I write for another purpose.

Viz. to show you that apparently I was right in saying this morning, that it is useless waiting for a quiet time. I really begin to think that unless I give up St. Mary's now, I shall never be able—i.e. without some great disturbance. Certainly if L.'s departure from us is a reason for remaining still at present, this man's departure would be ten times the reason. Not that he is very closely connected with me personally.

Ever yours affectionately,  
JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—Palmer has written a kind note, saying that on my remonstrance he shall withdraw the private conversation introduced into his pamphlet.

N.B.—Since I have gone so far in the resignation, is it well to go back and have it all over again? e.g. I have got over or nearly so the pain at Derby. *Am* I fit to hold preferment?

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. F. W. FABER

Littlemore: Sept. 2, 1843.

My dear Faber,—I have seen your letter to your brother dated Bologna, Aug. 22, and while I am both surprised

and put out at your very kind language about me, (of which it is but a plain truth to say that I am quite unworthy) yet I will not deny that I could not help being much pleased, more perhaps than is consistent with the consciousness of what I am, at being spoken of in such terms by you.

I assure you, my dear Faber, as perhaps you can guess without my telling you, that I go very far with you in the matter of which your letter treats, much farther than I like: and that my heart leaps forward when I hear certain things said, so as to give me a good deal of anxiety.

One thing, however, I feel very strongly—that a very great experiment, if the word may be used, is going on in our Church—going on, not over. Let us see it out. Is it not our happiness to follow God's Hand? if He did not act, we should be forced to act for ourselves: but if He is working, if He is trying and testing the English Church, if He is proving whether it admits or not of being Catholicized, let us not anticipate His decision; let us not be impatient, but look on and follow.

Have you heard of that remarkable ordination at New York, I mean Mr. Arthur Carey's? surely we have no notion of what is coming. Here is a man ordained by the Bishop of the most prominent American Diocese, with the zealous co-operation of nearly all his Presbyters, on his avowal that the Roman Creed so little distresses him, that, if refused ordination in the Anglican Church, he will not say that he may not apply to the Roman.

Is it not the ordinary way of Providence, both as a precept and a mercy, that men should not make great changes by themselves, or on private judgement, but should change with the body in which they find themselves, or at least in company?

Ought not, moreover, a certain term of probation to be given to oneself, before so awful a change as that I am alluding to? e.g. I have sometimes thought that, were I tempted to go to Rome, I should for three years pray, and get my friends to pray, that I might die rather than go,

if going were wrong. Do not suppose I am recommending this to another: nay I am not sure it would not be presumptuous in any case, but I put it down as an illustration.

Excuse this rude letter, which may disturb and annoy you rather than anything else, though I hope not. Be sure you have been in my prayers, such as they are, sometime, and believe me,

My dear Faber, with great sympathy,

Most sincerely yours,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—I am led to add, what we once touched on in conversation, how forlorn one's state would be, if any reaction of mind came on after a change. Surely one ought to be three years in the one purpose of changing before venturing on it.

The Sermon spoken of in the following letter is the first of the four enumerated a few pages back—the 'Invisible Presence of Christ.' It was on the text, 'The Kingdom of God cometh not with observation; neither shall they say, Lo here! or Lo there! for behold the Kingdom of God is within you.' It would be impossible to convey to the reader, in a few words, any idea of the marvellously pathetic beauty of this Sermon, but the following sentences culled from it will, perhaps, enable him to appreciate Keble's criticism of it. Outward tokens had failed the communion to which the preacher belonged, there was nothing left but to fall back upon inward experiences of Divine Grace.

"We see not our tokens." (Psalm 74, 10). . . . Who among us does not participate in this ancient trial? for who would account that to be the Church of God in which, we are, if he went merely by sight? Who has not cause to appeal, and who may not appeal, and who will not find an answer when he appeals, to the Notes of the Kingdom, which abides as it came "without observation" . . . which is "within us." Yes, I say, who among us may not, if he will, lead such a life as to have these secret and truer tokens to rest his faith on, so as to be sure, and certain, and convinced, that the Church which baptised us has still the Presence of Christ. . . .? , . . . What are signs and tokens

. . . but the way to Christ? What need of *them*, should it so be, through His mercy, that we have found Him? ' <sup>1</sup>

In the 'Apologia' Newman speaks of this line of argument as 'especially abhorrent both to my nature, and to my past professions.' Subjectivism and building upon *religious experiences* was one of the chief grounds of his quarrel with Evangelicalism; yet now he had to fall back upon such *experiences*, not indeed for the whole of his religious faith, but to assure himself that he was a member of the Church of Christ. <sup>2</sup>

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

September 4, 1843.

I am ashamed to think, dearest N., that I should have left your notes, now three in number, any time unanswered. I wish I may not have caused you more suspense and discomfort than was necessary. You know partly why I dread writing on such subjects. However, I must now say what seems right for the time, and hope that it will be turned to good rather than ill.

First as to St. Mary's, I cannot say any thing against such feelings and considerations as you allege; and after all, what right have we to expect to see our way clearly in respect of consequences? You can but do what seems right for the time, taking care not to act from mere impulse, and there is Another to be trusted with the results.

As to the Sermons, I am clearly for publishing them, with certain modifications (which I will mention presently) and it will be a relief to me to find that you are able to do so, some of your expressions have sounded so strong another way.

The change I want is in that on the Kingdom of God being within us. I think that in what you say both of the inward and outward Notes of that Kingdom, you imply an expectation of rather more certainty than we have a right to

<sup>1</sup> *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, pp. 318, 319.

<sup>2</sup> For the peril of relying on feelings and *experiences* see *Ang. Diff.* Lecture III.

look for as to our position ; and some of your phrases seem over bold in dispensing with the outward tokens. [*Vid.* 'Apolog.,' p. 157, 2nd ed., J. H. N.]

E.g. 'What are signs and tokens of any kind' etc. This sounds to me a little too like what one has been used to blame in Knox or in John Valdeso. Under both these heads I should like something more of Bishop Butler's tone. You will say you are writing for people who have strong feelings and pressing wants, which Butler's tone will not satisfy ; but might they not be taught to subdue their feelings and wait for their wants to be supplied ? Perhaps, as Butler writes, this unsatisfied state may be the very education intended for them. Who can tell but there may be something of *self* in their longings, which the highest strain of piety would guide them to overcome ? I would instance even in this last case, (though I trust I have no harsh thoughts about it,) why did Mr. L. call on Gentili ? Was it not putting himself in a way to be unsettled ? and how came he to forget his promise, not even seeking to be released from it, before he committed himself ? These are obvious questions, though of course they may be answered satisfactorily.

I certainly should be glad to see recognised in this or some other part of your Sermons the duty of men's remaining where they are, not only as long as they have spiritual consolations, but even under any degree of distress and doubt. There should be at least a moral certainty, before people make such a move. Then ought not all people to suspect that it is at least as much their own fault as their Church's, if they do not find Christ's tokens there ? And, if there be danger of evil spirits seducing us either way, is not the danger less on the side of patience and acquiescence ? provided always, of course, that there be real self-denial.

I shall try to send the Sermons back to-morrow. I can add no more now.

Ever yours very affectionately,

J. KEBLE.



J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Basingstoke : September 5, 1843.

My dear Keble,—I am indeed to you a Job's messenger. Here am I, having been summoned from Oxford yesterday on a very painful errand. *Another* person, still more important, as I should say, than the last mentioned has surprised me by telling me he must go over to Rome, and I really cannot tell whether I have succeeded in stopping him. At least I cannot get him to give me any promise.

Really I cannot keep St. Mary's on—and what is so very uncomfortable, these efforts to stop others do *me* harm—for I feel that the collision which drives them from Rome drives me, as is natural, in the other direction. I know I cannot speak in a sufficient *real* way about it and did I feel ever so duly, my words would be cold upon paper, but I much fear to-day's conversation has done me a good deal of harm, that is, has increased my conviction of the false position we are in, if that is harm.

I wish I felt more deeply than I do how I am paining you. But surely I must tell you how things are.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. N.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

September 5, 1843.

I mean to send back your two Sermons to-day, and I must say a word or two more on that which I wrote about yesterday, though perhaps not much to the purpose.

I have been looking at your Sermons in vol. 2, on the Invisible and Visible Church, and am not quite sure whether the views of the two are consistent; I mean, that of this with those former ones; and perhaps reviewing the one might correct the other, and preserve it from abuse.

My own feeling is to dread depending on seeming experiences, and in a great degree on the goodness of others also (though I do indeed feel that to turn one's back on a Communion, while such a person as Pusey (e.g.) remains in it

would be a great responsibility) ; but I was going to say that my leaning is to depend rather on the outward Notes of the Church which remain, however obscured, such as the Creeds, the Sacraments, and the Succession, and to hope that they might justify remaining, and constitute a real, though imperfect union. The parable of a Tree, or of a State, if carried out, will present things analogous to this.

No doubt you have thought of all this, and perhaps you have written and published it long since, but I must say what comes into my mind, and you will bear with me.

I have answered Palmer's letter, telling him that I know not how I could be a party to any such public disavowal of the 'B(ritish) C(ritic)' etc. as he wishes, being really too unversed in the controversy, and feeling that I had already said or seemed to say much more than my knowledge warranted.

About my seeing your Journal, I know not what to say : only this : If you think it but possible that it may help me to be useful to you, do not keep it back under the notion of not paining me. For whom ought I cheerfully to bear a little annoyance, if not for you, who have been such a friend to me in my need, to say nothing of other claims. So Good-bye and believe me,

Ever your very affectionate,

J. K.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

Basingstoke : September 5, 1843.

I ought to write you a line to say that the movement is going so fast, that some of the wheels are catching fire. I am returning from an expedition in which I have done my utmost to set matters right, but I doubt whether I have succeeded even for a time.

Of course all this is very secret. Perhaps you have heard the misfortune which has happened to me at Littlemore. Poor Lockhart, an intimate friend of Mr. Grant of St. John's,<sup>1</sup> (who went over a year and a half since),

<sup>1</sup> The Rev. Ignatius Grant, S.J., M.A. Oxford.

and who came to me on condition of making me a promise that he would remain quiet for three years, leaving me for a holiday of three weeks about a month since, wrote me word about 10 days ago that he was conforming to the Church of Rome. It has not got into the papers yet, I believe. He was quite overcome by the fascination of Dr. Gentili of Loughborough, and is going forthwith to enter the order of Charity (Rosminian).

Unless something very extraordinary happens, I expect to resign St. Mary's in the course of a few weeks.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore : September 6, 1843.

My dear Keble,—I shall send you all four sermons, of which you have seen the first, and you shall say whether your objections apply still—meanwhile I will think over them. Somehow I cannot deny that *some* clear notes are promised in Scripture to the Christian Church—doubt in its most distressing form, i.e. when there is *nothing* clear, is apparently excluded by the promise of a 'city set on a hill,' our 'eyes seeing our teachers' etc. The doubt to be borne is incidental, concomitant doubt, in spite of clear notes. If then we, as a Church, have not the outward notes, we must look for others. And moreover as to the duty of patience, on the other hand think of the duty of fleeing from the wrath to come. The feeling comes on men 'Light has been given to *me*—I have had the suggestion, which others have not, that our Church wants the notes of the true Church. (*Of course* one should think of *evil* suggestions, but that is a ground, not for patience, but caution.) If I were to die, I should be in a state which others are not in.' This distracting feeling comes on men not unfrequently. This is what I should say *prima facie*.

I suppose the Catholic theory is, that creeds, sacraments, succession etc. are nothing without unity—*vid.* St. Cyprian

of the Novatians, and St. Austin of the Donatists. The only way I have ever attempted to answer this, is by arguing that we really were, or in one sense were, in unity with the rest of the Church—but, as you know, I never have been thoroughly satisfied with my arguments, and grew more and more to suspect them.

Another thing I wish you would consider. I felt the argument of the Four Sermons when I wrote them—I feel it now (tho' not so strongly, I suppose,<sup>1</sup>)—I think it is mainly (whether correctly analysed in them and drawn out, or not) what reconciles me to our position. But I don't feel confident, judging of myself by former changes, that I shall think it a good argument 5 years hence. Now, is it fair, I think it is, to put forward the argument under such circumstances? I think it *is* fair to stop people in a headlong movement, (if it be possible)—to give them time to think—to give the English cause the advantage of this argument—and to see what comes of it, as to myself, so to others. A man only said to me to-day, 'You have not an idea of the effect of those Sermons when you preach them.' However, you shall judge whether it is trifling with so solemn a thing as truth.

As to my journal, I will think over the matter at my leisure. I have been much hurried lately. Letters, many painful ones, to answer, and matters to settle. Perhaps one or other of us may have something to say about it in a little time. Meanwhile I will from time to time go on with the journal.

Ever yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—You must bear in mind that, if I speak strongly in various places in the Sermons against the existing state of things, it is not wantonly, but to show *I feel the difficulties* which certain minds are distressed with.

<sup>1</sup> These words were written over the line—they were apparently an afterthought.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

September 7, 1843.

Your letters, as you may suppose, make me rather giddy, and put me out of breath; but I wish I felt the distress more keenly than I do. For instance, I got your Basingstoke note in Winchester yesterday, and brooded over it during my walk home; and yet I lost none of my night's rest by it; whereas, if one felt it more, one might perhaps be able to say or do something that might be of use to you.

Will you let me mention your case in general without name or description to one or two of the persons to whom I should most wish my own perplexities to be known for such a purpose, that they may do what they can to help you? Their hearts are not hardened, as it were, against deep sympathy with the doubts of others, by a kind of blind feeling that themselves have too much reason to doubt whether they are as yet the sort of persons who can be in any Church at all, a feeling which I am sometimes afraid is at the bottom of my coldness.

I suppose you say to yourself and others what often occurs to me, 'Let me imagine for a moment that I had made this change, should I be free from trouble of the same sort? Surely, to mention no more, the necessity of pleading with others on the contrary side to that which is now laid upon me, would by itself keep me unsettled.' The collision would work then its natural effect, as it does now; unless we suppose a kind of miraculous peace which it may be questioned whether we have a right to look for in this world.

I quite thirst after some other counsellor for you. Now Pusey is better, had you not better impart somewhat at least of the case to him?

We are in much care about my brother, whose work seems clearly too much for him.

Ever your most affectionate,

J. K.

LETTER TO THE BISHOP OF OXFORD RESIGNING  
ST. MARY'S

September 7, 1843.

My dear Lord,—I shall give your Lordship much pain I fear by the request which it is necessary for me to make of your Lordship before I proceed to act upon a resolution, on which I have made up my mind, for a considerable time to act. It is to ask your Lordship's permission to resign St. Mary's. If I intended such a step three years since, as I have said to your Lordship in print, it is not surprising that I should have determined on it now, when so many Bishops have said such things of me, and no one [has] undertaken my part in respect to that interpretation of the Articles under which alone I can subscribe them. I will not ask your Lordship to put yourself to the pain of replying to this request, but shall interpret your silence as an assent.

Were I writing to any one but your Lordship it might be presumption to suppose I should be asked to reconsider the request which I have been making, but kindness like yours may lead you to suspend your permission. If so, I may be allowed to say in a matter on which I am able to speak, that I should much deplore such an impediment, as probably leading to results, which would more than disappoint your Lordship's intentions in interposing it. My resolution is already no secret to my friends and others. Let me heartily thank your Lordship for all your past acts of friendship and favour to one who has been quite unworthy of them, and believe me my Lord to be keenly alive to your anxieties about the state of the Church, and to feel great sorrow as far as I am the occasion of them. On the other hand I will say on my own behalf, that I have ever felt great love and devotion towards your Lordship, that I have ever wished to please you, that I have honestly tried to bear in mind that I was in a place of high trust in the Church, and have laboured hard to uphold and strengthen her, and to retain her members. I am not relaxing my zeal till it has

been disowned by her rulers. I have not retired from her service till I have lost or forfeited her confidence.

That your Lordship's many good words and works for her welfare may be a blessing in this life, and a full reward in the next is the prayer of your Lordship's

Affectionate servant,  
J. H. NEWMAN.

The following letter contains Keble's criticism of the Four Sermons. The MS. which was submitted to him does not seem to have been preserved. Most of his suggestions, judging from the printed text, seem to have been adopted. Keble's references are, of course, to the pages of the MS. When it was possible the corresponding page in the *Uniform Edition* has been added.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

September 18, 1843.

At last I return your Sermons. They have been kept too long, but I could not speak of them hastily, and I have also taken the liberty of showing them to one or two trustworthy persons, who might assist me to judge of their probable effect.

The result is that I wish them certainly to be published, and shall be greatly disappointed and grieved if your subsequent modification of opinion should have gone so far as to prevent this. From your letters I should judge that it had not, and also from your having advertised the Sermons; but really of this point you yourself are alone competent to judge.

I must tell you in fairness that one person who has seen the sermons thought the first of them rather unsettling, as having the air of a person struggling against his own conviction; but from the middle of Sermon 3 and onwards the same person thought there was no such appearance. It has occurred to me that it might be well to have something in your Preface like some of Jeremy Taylor's introductions, warning persons not to take it in hand who either 1. leading good lives are without painful scruples at present or 2. have

cause to think that their restlessness is unhallowed. For I suppose you mean it strictly for those who are 1. trying to be good and holy, 2. doubt whether this be a Church. Either in the Preface or quite early in the course it seems to me that there should be a distinct setting aside of the case of those persons whose scruples are not accompanied with settled strictness of life.<sup>1</sup>

Have baptised persons a right to enquire and judge about visible notes, till they have fairly and long tried to obtain the invisible ?

Might it be well to insert about the 12th or 13th page of the first Sermon, where the restlessness of so many is described, a word of distinct caution, that most of it probably (it is hard to limit the quantity) comes of people's own fault ? E.g. if I could hear of some thoroughly good and obedient child of our Church, *who had never heard or read of our controversies*, yet permanently disquieted at the want of visible unity, I should think it a stronger witness than any case I have heard of yet.

Then with respect to doubt and caution, surely if people cannot always expect to be comfortable even about such points as you mention in your Parochial Sermons, I. 272, doubt about the Church tokens may also consist with a state of salvation ; and the analogy of duty to earthly parents, and content with one's present state and home seems to indicate the course of conduct to be pursued while the doubt lasts ; and the same, with regard to the misgiving one feels, from what quarter the doubt or suggestion may come. And if we see enough to guide our practice, ought we to depend on more in the way of comfort ? especially considering how most of us have lived ?

E.g. in p. 16 I should, I think, modify your expression as follows :—' Who among us may not, if he will lead such a life, as to have those secret and truer tokens to rest his faith upon, so as to be sure etc.'<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> This advice was carried out. See footnote p. 308 in *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*.

<sup>2</sup> This suggestion was acted upon, p. 319.



The case should be considered of those who have not yet these inward tokens in our Church. What are they to do? Should not they somewhere be distinctly told to wait till they have them, (i.e. till they are better men and worthier communicants), before they judge against our Church?

In p. 66 I think the proposed defence by appeal to the Divines of the eighteenth century is imperfect,<sup>1</sup> especially as we are used to blame that style of divinity so much. Perhaps it may suffice to accompany it with the prefatory caution above suggested.

In p. 14, 15<sup>2</sup> 'well nigh deserted us'; would it not be well to specify the signs which seem to be *going*? Those gone are, I believe, enumerated, at least exemplified afterwards.

P. 43.<sup>3</sup> Is there not a secret shrinking from what we are invited *to*, which has part in the awful constraining force you speak of? a feeling 'though this were not idolatry in others, it would be so in me?' and do not those persons who seem to have most right to guide one's judgment feel this most strongly?

In p. 19<sup>4</sup> you seem to speak of the corruption of religion as a token of the absence of Christ; is it so simply, or of His Presence for Judgment? What do people say of Italy now?

Might not some of the cautionary matter of the 3rd Sermon (e.g. p. 54) be usefully inserted or referred to *before* entering on the argument in p. 19?

The top of p. 17 still sounds to me a little rationalistic.

P. 25.<sup>5</sup> Our Lord in XVI. St. John *speaks to the secret thoughts* of His disciples, does He not?

The view about Elijah strikes me particularly. I feel as if I had there got what I have been long feeling after myself. It seems to me curious, in reference to it that both our Collects about St. John Baptist (which you refer to) are of Anglican origin.

In p. 72 you speak of the perishable nature of heresies,

<sup>1</sup> P. 356. This suggestion seems to have been acted upon.      <sup>2</sup> P. 318.

<sup>3</sup> P. 339. This suggestion was not acted upon. Keble probably had in his mind invocations of the Saints.

<sup>4</sup> P. 320.

<sup>5</sup> P. 334.

which have lasted from the 5th century; and in p. 73 (at bottom), I suppose a Presbyterian would deny your statement.<sup>1</sup>

And now I think I have pretty well inflicted all my notes and marks upon you. I wish they may be of any use; but, as I said, it is a case in which after all you must judge entirely for yourself. I the more wish the Sermons may be published from the manner in which your resignation, reported in the newspapers, is already being taken. I had a letter from a man this morning, who considers it as equivalent to the giving up of 'Catholic Anglicanism.'

I cannot recollect that I have more to say at present. Arthur Perceval, who has been very ill, wants a curate for six months, and it has occurred to me that, if they can get a place to be in, it will be a nice refreshing change for my brother, and perhaps Copeland might now take Bisley. Will you mention it to him? for I quite long to have something settled for Tom's relief.

We shall think of you very much, especially next week.<sup>2</sup>

Ever your grateful and affectionate,

J. KEBLE.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore: In fest. S. Mich., 1843.

My dear Keble,—I am so cast down by various things, that I have hardly heart to think what I have to say to you. What chiefly presses on me is Bowden's illness. It is hardly right perhaps to say I despair of him. And he is all the while so kind and quiet and happy.

I should be truly obliged and grateful if you got any persons to remember me in the way you proposed.

As to the Sermons, it seems to me that, the more I feel dissatisfied with the Catholicity of our Church, the more I cannot help making much of and really accepting the view contained in *them*, if I am content to remain in it—I think then that I may very honestly publish these, for they do contain my present judgment.

<sup>1</sup> P. 36r.

<sup>2</sup> (When the anniversary of the consecration of Littlemore Chapel came round.—J. H. N.)

The only thing I feel is, distrust in the *permanence* of that judgment, formed on the experience of the past. And further it seems a sort of private judgment in Scripture, which is unauthorized by any one ecclesiastical writer, as far as I know. But as to the latter of these objections, our position is our own, such as no writer can be expected to have anticipated—and as to the chance of future change, if this were an argument for not *avowing* what I now believe, it would be an argument surely for not acting upon it, i.e. for leaving the Church, which is absurd. If I have reasons for being content and thankful to be where I am, why may I not give them?—(I dare say I may have to modify some expressions.)

Again, have I a *right* to suppress a view which has been influential with others, and *may* be intended to answer a good purpose?

And further, if the view *did* take a number of persons, and that permanently, it would have, and ought to have a great effect upon me—my only present misgiving relating to its holding water. *Solvitur ambulando.*

On these grounds, if you do not think them unreal, I propose to publish.

I think on the whole I shall send you the 10 days journal I spoke to you of. Of course I cannot tell, but I don't think it will over pain you—that is, I think you may perhaps be prepared for it, on the whole, if not in detail.

Of course in *detail*, it is no correct specimen of me—no 10 days account could be—but it gives a general idea. I have put down, not only infirmities, but temptations, even when I did not feel them to be more than external to me. Also, I have shown you how the day went—tho' of course every ten days varies much in this respect. E.g. the next ten days were very *busy* ones, in editing etc.

I have, as you may suppose, been very much concerned about your brother.

Ever yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—I trust Eden will take Copeland.

The following fragment of a letter is of some importance, for it shows how far Newman was as yet from a final decision. In this way it serves as a corrective to the correspondence with Archdeacon Manning of a few days later. The impression which this correspondence, taken by itself, might leave on the mind of the reader is that Newman in the autumn of 1843 saw his way much more clearly than he actually did.

‘Keep Thou my feet : I do not ask to see  
The distant scene—one step enough for me.’

These lines almost sum up the spirit in which Newman resigned St. Mary’s.

The conclusion of the letter is missing. The opening part is so full of erasures as to be quite unintelligible. Everything which might afford a clue to the name of the person to whom it was addressed was in later years carefully blotted out.

#### JOHN HENRY NEWMAN TO AN UNKNOWN CORRESPONDENT

Sept. 29, 1843.

. . . First I will say that A. B. had no right to tell what he told you about me, and I shall write to him to beg him not to do the like to others. Next, J. has not understood me, certainly has not quoted my words.

I do so despair of the Church of England, I am so evidently cast off by her, and on the other hand I am so drawn to the Church of Rome, that I think it *safer* as a matter of honesty not to keep my living.

This is a very different thing from having any *intention* of joining the Church of Rome. However, to avow generally as much as I have now said, would be wrong for ten thousand reasons, which I have not time to enter upon here, and I hardly think you will consider necessary. People cannot understand a state of doubt, of misgiving, of being unequal to responsibilities, etc., but they will conclude either that you have a clear view one way or the other. All I know is, that I could not without hypocrisy profess myself any longer a teacher in and champion of our Church. Very

few persons know this—hardly one person (only one, I think) in Oxford—not any one in Oxford at present. I think it most cruel, most unkind, most unsettling to tell them . . .

JOHN HENRY NEWMAN TO AN UNKNOWN  
CORRESPONDENT

Oct. 7, 1843.

. . . I don't believe you when you talk [*erasures*] of your having had these opinions so long. I don't believe it. I think you never would have gone on [*erasures*, presumably referring to some work undertaken by the person addressed] with the spirit and good heart you did, after my strong discouragement, unless at that time *I* had felt much *less* confidence in the Church of England than you. Now, I did not feel so little then as I do now, and you now feel less than I do now.

Now as to yourself, surely the case of poor Sibthorpe should be taken as a warning to all of us against sudden moves. Our Lord tells us to count the cost, how can you tell whether it is His voice, or that of a deceiving spirit. It is a rule in spiritual matters to reject a suggestion at first to anything extraordinary, from the certainty that if it is from heaven it will return.

I should say that you should put yourself on a probation, and resolve not to move for three years—making this exception, if you feel it necessary, that in case of the imminent prospect of death you might conform at once, as the safest and best you could do *under* the circumstances. This is what we do, as to baptizing infants—administering private baptism in cases of danger. It is borne out too by the beliefs of the early Church about catechumens; the *intention* of baptism being equivalent to baptism. And surely a delay which has for its sole object to ascertain God's will, is of the same kind.

Then again, I think you should, as much as you can, put the question out of your head—being sure that conviction will come in spite of that, if it is from God. You

should certainly give yourself to some direct religious duties. You should observe what your state is in six months time, and if then, or at any intermediate time, you *awoke* out of your present feelings as out of a dream, then, if they returned, I think you should begin your three years again. Surely when we are told 'to try the spirits,' we cannot be wrong in thus acting. *Magna est veritas et prevalebit.* And I cannot understand how one can have any fear lest it be resisting grace.

Do not think I am saying this by way of getting you off the subject altogether. I feel confident that such rules will have no such tendency. Delay seems to me the path *in* which people are led *forward*—most haste, worst speed. And the older one is, the more time it takes to learn, and to ascertain that one has a *πρόθεσις*, a *προαίρεσις*. Young men may take a resolution, right or wrong, on impulse, and keep to it, for their minds are supple—but there is a grave retribution, when those who have something of a fixed character act on a sudden idea, or in a novel frame of mind, for their habitual state of feeling returns upon them, and they feel that they have changed into an element in which they cannot live. I know the gift of faith will overcome this, when it is God's call, but only by waiting can a man either gain this gift, or be sure that he is called.

I think you should be very much on your guard against self-will. You should not be *αὐτόνομος*, your own master. I have a right to say this, for I very seldom act of myself. Now you seem to me always to act of yourself, and not to mind others. This was your way when an undergraduate—I almost think that I have heard you say that it was your way at school. And certainly lately about [*erasure*] you have not minded what I said one word, though now you have come to do the very thing of *yourself*, which I have been so long advising you. Now if you *ought* in this matter to act for yourself, here is an additional reason for taking time. We can be critics on our own past selves, not on our present. If you allow yourself a year *hence*

to judge of your feelings *now*, you approximate to taking the advice of another.

I understand you in your last letter to say you will act deliberately, but I think it no harm to send you this.

Ever yours affectly.,

J. H. N.

The above should be compared with a letter to Pusey of July 22, 1845 (see p. 383). In proportion as Newman saw his own way more clearly, he was unable to recommend to others long probationary periods.

#### ARCHDEACON MANNING TO J. H. NEWMAN

October 8, 1843.

My dear Newman,—I had intended to come to Littlemore yesterday to see you : but I was in so much pain from a cold in my face that I most unwillingly gave it up at the moment I was getting into a fly to come here, the Bishop of Oxford having asked me to spend Sunday at Cuddesdon.

For the last month I have been travelling about, and have been as far as Bangor, and Hull, York and Durham, so that you may believe I have had little quiet. But you have been constantly in my thoughts : and all this made me wish more than ever to see you yesterday. And yet my chief reason for wishing to see you would be for the sake of old kindness : for I do not feel that I ought to volunteer any unsought expressions on your late resignation of St. Mary's, for which ever since you talked to me 2 or 3 years ago I have been more or less prepared.<sup>1</sup> Also I feel that one ought to know and understand far more of the interior of each other's minds to be able to form any view of what is right and reasonable in each one's position. I believe the amount of all I should endeavour to express is an affectionate regard and a real participation in all that distresses you. I suppose it is next to impossible that employments so distant and different as ours, if I may venture to compare them, should not introduce differences of

<sup>1</sup> It was in October 1840 that Newman first consulted Keble about resigning St. Mary's. *Apologia*, pp. 132 ff.

view and feeling : and I have always a desire to understand yours more clearly, and to be understood by you in turn.

I hope this may be, for Charity and confidence are the true bonds of the Church.

I shall hope to see you at the beginning of next month, as I shall, please God, be again in Oxford. Believe me,

My dear Newman,

Yours affectly,

H. E. MANNING.

### J. H. NEWMAN TO ARCHDEACON MANNING<sup>1</sup>

Oriel College : October 14, 1843.

My dear Manning,—I thank you very warmly for your most kind letter—and would tell you in a few words why I have resigned St. Mary's, as you seem to wish, were it possible to do so. But it is most difficult to bring out in brief—or even *in extenso*—any just view of my feelings and reasons.

The nearest approach I can give to a general account of them is to say that it has been caused by the general repudiation of the view contained in No. 90 on the part of the Church. I could not stand against such an unanimous expression of opinion from the Bishops, supported as it has been by the concurrence, or at least silence, of all classes in the Church lay and clerical. If there ever was a cause in which an individual teacher has been put aside, and virtually put away by a community, mine is one. No decency has been observed in the attacks upon me from authority : no protests have appeared against them. It is felt, I am far from denying, justly felt, that I am a foreign material—and cannot assimilate with the *Church* of England.

Even my own Bishop has said that my very mode of interpreting the Articles makes them mean anything or nothing. When I heard this delivered I did not believe my ears. I denied to others that it was said. Pusey and

<sup>1</sup> This and the two next letters of Newman's were published in the *Apologia*.



I asked the Bishop and were satisfied by his answer—when out came the Charge, and the words could not be mistaken. This astonished me the more, because I published that letter to him (how unwillingly you know) on the understanding that I was to deliver his judgment on No. 90 *instead* of him. A year elapses, and a second and heavier judgment came forth. I did not bargain for this. Nor did he, but the tide was too strong for him.

I fear I must confess that in proportion as I think the English Church is showing herself intrinsically and radically alien from Catholic principles, so do I feel the difficulties in defending her claims to be a branch of the Catholic Church. It seems a dream to call a communion Catholic, when one can neither appeal to any clear statement of Catholic doctrine in its formularies, nor interpret ambiguous formularies by the received and living sense past or present. Men of Catholic views are too truly but a party in our Church. I cannot deny that other independent circumstances, which it is not worth while entering into, have led me to the same conclusion. I do not say all this to everybody, as you may suppose—but I do not like to make a secret of it to you.

affectly yrs,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

Manning forwarded Newman's letter to Mr. Gladstone, with a letter of his own which, unfortunately, has not yet been published. Gladstone replied on October 24.<sup>1</sup> He was considerably alarmed by Newman's letter. He thought that Newman was unduly depressed by the strictures on Tract 90. 'I confess,' he said, 'that his uneasiness at the time of the Jerusalem adventure appeared to me more intelligible. But as you truly say, so far is the English Church, the subjective English Church, from showing herself by a series of progressive acts to be "intrinsically and radically alien from Catholic principles" that the progression is all the other way,' &c.

<sup>1</sup> The date is worth noting. Manning did not wait till he heard from Gladstone before writing his second letter to Newman. Gladstone's letter is printed in full in Lathbury's *Correspondence on Church and Religion of W. E. Gladstone*, vol. i. p. 281.

## ARCHDEACON MANNING TO J. H. NEWMAN

Lavington : October 23, 1843.

My dear Newman,—I received your letter with very great interest and thank you sincerely for writing so fully to me.

It seems to me hardly right for me to form any view on a case so complicated as yours. One ought to know so much more than any but one or two, or perhaps the principal alone can know. However your letter suggests to me some things which I should like just to say and leave them.

Surely you cannot feel that the Church of England regards you as a foreign ingredient. With whose writings has it so strongly and widely sympathized? For years, who has been more loved and revered? Individuals have opposed you always, and latterly, since No. 90, persons bearing office in the Church—but what has the Church as such—or any great mass of the Church expressed? Without entering upon No. 90 in detail, could you expect the living generation to change the opinions, prejudices, and habits of a whole life in a few years at one bidding? Has not God prospered you in the last ten years in a measure which makes it—may I venture to say—impatience something like Jonah's to ask or look for more? Indeed, my dear Newman, I feel this strongly and am sure that the adversary both of the Church and of your self would compass his own ends in casting over you such an illusion as that you should believe yourself to be a foreign ingredient—You will not take it ill of me if I even go on to say that I cannot conceive any man under the conditions of our erring humanity to escape mixing into ten years of such work as yours matters which may be reasonably excepted against things 'quas aut incuria fudit etc.'

I entirely disbelieve the impression you have is true—and am persuaded that patience and quietness will reassure all that are to be reassured; for some must always oppose themselves so long as the Church standeth.

Another thing suggested by your letter is this. Surely if one compares the English Church now with what it was ten

years back it cannot be said truly that it is showing itself intrinsically alien from Catholic principles. That the Church has passed under a fearful influence for 150 years is sadly true ; but surely the last ten years have dispelled much and brought the living church back again in a wonderful way—to be explained no otherwise than by a belief in God's mercy to us—to a preparation of heart for Catholicity when it can be seen and known as such. May we not be too hasty?—patience and love of one another is what we want most. What may not be the state of the English Church ten years hence when the last century is passed, and a generation born and trained in better things has arisen? Is not your painful feeling ' a judging before the time ' ?

I feel almost unwilling to go on for it seems unfit in me to write to you in this way—But let me add one more thing. You feel that men of Catholic views are but a party in our church. Must we not say the same of every church in the world? Is the popular belief in any part of Christendom of such a kind that Catholic minds are not esoteric everywhere. e.g. Can we say that minds possessed with the popular views prevalent in Roman Catholic countries are ' Catholic ' in the sense we are now intending : and are not instructed Roman Catholics a school in their own communion? Indeed must it not always be so : is it not the condition of the Church in all ages?

After all, even if Catholic minds are no more than a party in the English Church, it is plain that they have always existed in it, and therefore that they are not foreign ingredients, but such as the Church has ever retained, and fostered, and drawn large measures of blessing from. Indeed I would say they are her true sons faintly sustaining, and representing her real character in the midst of the many who sink below her tone, and rule, and are foreign to her.

As I have written all this I must send it, if only to express my regard, and thanks to you. You perhaps may think me too hopeful : but I am full of good hope arising out of living facts which I see daily : and I believe a few years will ripen them into things you desire to see. I know there is

such a thing as vain hopes, but there is also such a thing as *δυσελπιστία* which sadly relaxes one's efforts and fulfils its own forebodings.

Believe me, my dear Newman,  
Yours affectly,  
H. E. MANNING.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO ARCHDEACON MANNING

Derby : October 25, 1843.

My dear Manning,—Your letter is a most kind one, but you have engaged in a most dangerous correspondence. I am deeply sorry for the pain I must give you.

I must tell you then frankly, unless I combat arguments which to me, alas, are shadows, that it is from no disappointment, irritation, or impatience, that I have, whether rightly or wrongly, resigned St. Mary's—but because I think the Church of Rome the Catholic Church, and ours not a part of the Catholic Church, because not in communion with Rome, and I felt I could not honestly be a teacher in it any longer.

This conviction came upon me last summer four years. I mentioned it to two friends in the autumn of that year, 1839. And for a while I was in a state of excitement.

It arose in the first instance from reading the Monophysite and Donatist controversies; in the former of which I was engaged in that course of theological study to which I had given myself.

This was at a time, when no Bishop, I believe, had declared against us, and when all was progress and hope. I do not think I have ever felt, certainly not then, disappointment or impatience, or the like; for I have never looked forward to the future, nor do I realize it now.

My first effort was to write that article on the Catholicity of the English Church in the 'British Critic,' and for two years it quieted me. But since the summer of 1839 I have written nothing on modern controversy. My Lectures on Romanism and Justification were in 1836–38. My writings

in the 'Tracts for the Times' end with 1838, except Bishop Andrewes's Devotions and Tract 90, which was forced on me. You know how unwillingly I wrote my letter to the Bishop of Oxford, in which (as the safest course under circumstances) I committed myself again. My University Sermons were a course begun; I did not finish them. The Sermon on Development was a subject intended for years. And I think its view *quite* necessary in justification of the Athanasian Creed.

The article I speak of quieted me till the end of 1841, *over* the affair of Tract 90, when that wretched Jerusalem Bishoprick affair, no personal matter, revived all my alarms. They have increased up to this moment.

You see then, that the various ecclesiastical and quasi-ecclesiastical acts, which have taken place in the course of the last two years and a half, are not the cause of my state of opinion; but are keen stimulants and weighty confirmations of a conviction forced on me, while engaged in *the course* of duty, viz. the theological reading which I had given myself. And this last mentioned circumstance is a fact which has never, I think, come before me till now that I write to you.

It is three years since, on account of my state of opinion, I urged the Provost in vain to let St. Mary's be separated from Littlemore, thinking I might with a safe conscience serve the latter, though I could not comfortably continue in so public a place as a University. This was before No. 90.

Finally I have acted under advice and that not of my own choosing but which came to me in the way of duty, nor of those only who agree with me, but of new friends who differ from me.

I have nothing to reproach myself with, as far as I see in the matter of importance, i.e. practically—or in conduct. And I trust that He who has kept me in the slow course of changes hitherto, may keep me still from hasty acts or resolves with a doubtful conscience.

This I am sure of, that such interposition as yours

*kind as it is, only does what you would consider harm.* It makes me realize my views to myself, it makes me see their consistency, it assures me of my own deliberateness—it suggests to me the traces of a Providential Hand. It takes away the pain of disclosures, it relieves me of a heavy secret. You may make what use of my letters you think right.

Yours etc.

J. H. N.

The above letter was also sent to Gladstone. Gladstone replied on the 28th, and again on the 30th, in a state of great excitement. 'My first thought is, "I stagger to and fro, like a drunken man, and am at my wits' end."' He jumped to the conclusion that when Newman spoke of the reluctance with which, in the Letter to the Bishop of Oxford, he had *committed himself for a second time*, he was practically avowing that he had said things which he did not believe. No doubt he could give a satisfactory explanation, but the world at large would not believe him. If his letters to Manning were divulged he would be a disgraced man, and the cause which he had advocated would be hopelessly discredited.<sup>1</sup>

#### ARCHDEACON MANNING TO J. H. NEWMAN

October 27, 1843.

My dear Newman,—It is impossible for me to refrain from writing to you. If I were, you might misunderstand my not writing, but I have no intention of saying any thing more than that the kind and affectionate feelings of years seemed to come altogether as I read your letter. By whatsoever path may we be led home to the rest where there is no more going out.

Numberless things keep me from saying a word more than my thanks for your openness.

<sup>1</sup> See p. 18. The letter was written at the time when Newman's doubts were in abeyance, and when the obstacles to communion with Rome, which he brought forward in it, seemed to him insurmountable. What he kept back from the world was the doubts which had assailed him in 1839, and the haunting possibility that they might return. To have revealed this would have been 'scattering firebrands,' and an act of disloyalty to the convictions which at the time were predominant in his mind.

Never think that I judged you in my last letter. But ignorant of the one master key of all I was led to shallow thoughts of the matter. May God ever bless and keep you, my dear Newman. You know all I feel, when I say that I am as ever

Yours affectionately,

H. E. MANNING.

It is well to add that your letter will be seen by only two, perhaps by only one person: but one or both they with myself will never be the channel through which your heavy secret shall be known.<sup>1</sup>

H. E. M.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO ARCHDEACON MANNING

October 31, 1843.

My dear Manning,—Your letter, which I got on my return here last night, has made my heart ache more and caused more and deeper sighs than any I have had a long while—tho' I assure you there is much on all sides of me to cause sighing and heart aches—on all sides; I am quite hampered by the one dreadful whisper repeated from so many quarters and causing the keenest distress to friends. You know but a part of my present trial, in knowing that I am unsettled myself.

Since the beginning of this year I have been obliged to tell the state of my mind to some others; but never I think without being in a way obliged, as from friends writing to me as you did, or guessing how matters stood. No one in Oxford knows it or here, but one near friend whom I felt I could not help telling the other day. But I suppose many more suspect it.

Though I am fully conscious of many sins which deserve any trouble, and fully think that this trouble is a direct

<sup>1</sup> Manning sent Newman's letters to Dr. Pusey, who wrote to Gladstone: 'Knowing Newman intimately, I do not think that the portentous expressions in his letters (forwarded to me by Manning) have a necessary or immediate bearing upon certain steps of outward conduct.'—Purcell's *Life of Manning*, vol. i. p. 352.

punishment on definite sins, though not in the way of cause and effect, yet I do seem to find a comfort in the feeling that we didn't make our present circumstances.

Ever yours affectly.,

J. H. N.

Manning was now thoroughly alarmed. He had written to Pusey an extraordinarily vehement letter in which he announced that he was 'reduced to the painful, saddening, sickening necessity' of saying what 'he felt about Rome.'<sup>1</sup> He did so in his celebrated 5th of November sermon. The next day he went to see Newman at Littlemore. This is how Froude described what happened :

'When I was at Littlemore with Newman, Manning came up to Oxford to preach the 5th of November sermon. He preached in so Protestant a tone, that Newman said, "If Manning comes to Littlemore I shall not see him." Mark Pattison and I were sitting with Newman when he was told that Manning had come. Newman said to me, "You must go and tell him, Froude, that I will not see him." I went and told Manning, who was greatly distressed, and I walked along the road some way with him, to give him what comfort I could.'<sup>2</sup>

In the following letter Newman discusses the projected 'Lives of the English Saints.'

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

Littlemore : November 2, 1843.

I am led to write to you about several things. First, I find that Pusey has mentioned to you, what he had not an opportunity of saying to me, that the 'Lives of the Saints' would cause a sensation. I wish I had something like a

<sup>1</sup> Purcell's *Life of Manning*, vol. i. pp. 251, 252.

<sup>2</sup> *Recollections of Dean Boyle*, p. 238. The late Father William Neville used to tell the story rather differently. According to him, Newman was out when Manning called. He never professed to have got his information from Newman himself, but even if he did, it would only prove that Newman's memory was at fault. For him the incident was over in a few seconds, and he may never have given it a thought afterwards. It was otherwise with Froude, who had come between the hammer and the anvil. His walk bareheaded along the road would fix every detail in his memory.



view, what was best to do about them. However, you misunderstand him in thinking that the tone was, 'None can doubt so and so, etc., etc., but a mere Protestant,' etc. (How could you fancy I should allow this?) No—the objection to the tone is *liking for Rome*. What P. has said has thrown me into great perplexity. I entered into the scheme, after the delay of months, for the sake of others; and I have reason to fear that stopping it may in various ways tend to precipitate certain persons (readers, if you will) towards Rome. Yet it is plain what *he* feels, will be felt far more by others.

I did not explain to you sufficiently the state of mind of those who are in danger. I only spoke of those who are convinced that our Church was external to the Church Catholic, though they felt it unsafe to trust their own private convictions. And you seemed to put the dilemma, 'Either men are in doubt or not: if in doubt, they ought to be quiet; if not in doubt, how is it that they stay with us?' But there are two other states of mind which might be mentioned. (1) Those who are unconsciously near Rome, and whose *despair* about our Church, if anyhow caused, would at once develop into a state of conscious approximation and *quasi*-resolution to go over. (2) Those who feel they can with a safe conscience remain with us, *while* they are allowed to testify in behalf of Catholicism, and to promote its interests; i.e. as if by such acts they were putting our Church, or at least a portion of it, in which they are included, in the position of catechumens. They think they may stay, while they are moving themselves, others, nay, say the whole Church, towards Rome. Is not this an intelligible ground? I should like your opinion of it.

While I am writing, I will add a word about myself. You may come near a person or two, who, owing to circumstances, know more exactly my state of feeling than you do, tho' they would not tell you. Now I do not like that you should not be aware of this, though I see no reason why you should know what they happen to know. Your wishing it otherwise would *be* a reason.

## TO THE SAME

Littlemore : November 6, 1843.

I do not mean to bore you, as you have quite enough to do without me ; but you shall answer me when you have time. I am drawing up my query in the manner of a *case* if I can manage it, for it was a curious point of casuistry, on which I am often in one shape or other called to give an opinion—but meantime I will speak about myself and the ‘Lives.’

You have not gone to the bottom of the difficulty. It is very easy to say, Give facts without comment ; but in the first place, what can be so dry as mere facts ? the books won’t sell, nor deserve to sell. It must be ethical ; but to be ethical is merely to colour a narrative with one’s own mind, and to give a *tone* to it. Now this is the difficulty, altering this or that passage, leaving out this or that expression will not alter the case. I will not answer for being aware of the tone in myself. Pusey put his finger on passages which I had not thought about. Is he to be ever marking passages ? if so, he has the real trouble of being editor, not I.

*Naturam expellas furca, &c.* Is the Pope’s supremacy the only point on which no opinion is to be expressed ? if so, why ? It is not more against the Articles to *desire* it than to desire monachism. Will it offend more than others ? I will not limit certainly the degree of disgust which some people will feel towards it, but do they feel less towards the notion of monks, or, again, of miracles ? Now Church History is made up of these three elements—miracles, monkery, Popery. If any sympathetic feeling is expressed on behalf of the persons and events of Church history, it is a feeling in favour of miracles, or monkery, or Popery, one or all. It is quite a theory to talk of being ethical, yet not concur in these elements of the narrative—unless, indeed, one adopts Milner’s or Neander’s device of dropping part of the history, praising what one has a fancy for, and thus putting a theory and dream in the

place of facts. But it is bad enough to be eclectic in *doctrine*.

Next it must be recollected how very much depends on the disposition, relative prominence, &c., of facts, it is quite impossible that a leaning to Rome, a strong offensive leaning should be hidden.

And then still more it must be recollected that a vast number of questions, and most important ones, are decided this way or that on antecedent probabilities, according to a person's views, e.g. the question between St. Augustine and the British Bishops—of Easter—of King Lucius, &c., &c. Opinion comes in at every step of the history.

From what I have said you will see that I consider it impossible to choose *easy* 'Lives' for the first of the series; there are none such, or if there be a few, when can I promise to have them ready? I suppose Bede must be pretty easy. Keble has it. I do not expect him to send it to me for several years, with his engagements. Take missions, take Bishops, the Pope comes in everywhere. Go to Aldheim and his schools; you have most strange miracles. Try to retire into the country, you do but meet with hermits. No; miracles, monkery, Popery, are too much for you, if you have any stomach.

It seems to me that this talk about 'beginning easily' (which Sir F. P. [Francis Palgrave?] has been eager in) is just like the fuss made, when we began the 'Fathers,' of taking easy Fathers. Some wished to begin chronologically, &c. &c. If we had gone on any such theory, we should have done none at all. And so I say about these 'Lives,' you may indefinitely postpone them by such precautions—you may show that they ought not to come out at all by your objections—but if they are to be published, they will make a sensation.

The Life P. looked at, St. Stephen's, was taken as having hardly, if at all, any miracle in it, and if he thinks it will give offence, doubtless the others will still more.

You see, in saying all this, I am not deciding the question whether the work is to be done *at all*. On that point I have had great doubt since P.'s objection. Only to do it

without offence, is impossible. And the more so, because, in part at least, it is likely to be a very taking work.

At first I was more than desirous to rid myself of it altogether—and Rivington is looking over the sheets to decide whether he will take it or give it up. And I think he will give it up. But a number of intricate questions come in.

Men have written, hoping for a fair emolument, and putting aside other means of gaining a livelihood. It seems very unfair to disappoint them. I know myself, when I was much younger, how very annoying such a disappointment is ; the more so, because it cannot be, or is not, hinted at.

And then so many Lives are in progress or preparation, that it is most unlikely the work will be stopped ; others will conduct it instead of me who will go farther ; and though this is a bad reason for doing oneself what one feels a misgiving in doing, it is a good reason when one feels none at all.

And then comes a question, whether, if I have no misgiving, it is not a duty. What right have I to be quiet, having the means of making a protest, when there is so great an effort on the other side to put down the Pope ! May it not be our mission to do what we cannot choose our time for doing ? I have been quiet now for three years nearly, as being under authority, and with a Bishop's censure against me. Am I never to move ?

These are the kind of questions which come across me. On the other hand there is a question whether it is not *infra dig.* to go to another publisher, Rivington rejecting—and whether well-wishers will not think I am losing myself in being party to any such publication. But other things might be mentioned in which they would consider I should be losing myself.

You see by all things I am in perplexity—but I suppose a little time may make things clearer.

If the plan is abandoned, the significant question will be, nay is already asked,—‘ What then, cannot the Anglican Church bear the Lives of her Saints ! ’

## TO THE SAME

Littlemore : November 26, 1843.

I am very much obliged by your kind letter—and sincerely am I sorry to have kept you, as I find, in suspense.

The truth is, I am so undecided, or was, what was best to do, that I began to write to you, and did not pursue it. And so far from your not having written to the purpose, you laid down one proposition, in which I quite acquiesce ; that the subject of the supremacy of Rome should be moved *argumentatively* if at all. I felt I had gained something here, and rested upon it and gave up answering you, as it turns out, selfishly.

But now I must say that when I came again to look at what Pusey was frightened at, I *could touch nothing*. There was no insinuation, no allusion to supremacy at all. It related a plain historical fact that St. Stephen went to Rome, as was customary—and the two reasons assigned had nothing to do with supremacy :—1st. that the Coliseum was there ! quoting Bede's saying. 2. that Rome was our Mother Church.

Yet, though I feel I could alter nothing, I am sure most people would *say* there was an insinuation. Why ? because people know our<sup>1</sup> wishes and then the mere stating a fact is approving of it. The only way to satisfy people would be a *plain protest the other way*—silence gives consent.

This has been seen in the case of Rivington, who, between ourselves, has read, has condemned, has given up the undertaking—and now I am quite at sea with a quantity of matter part printed, part written, part preparing, part promised,—and though the pecuniary loss would be serious, if I stopped, that is the least part of the difficulty—and I do not see but I must go on—though I suppose there will be some delay. There is no doubt that Rivington is taking a line. Pass a few months, and we shall better be able to see how things

<sup>1</sup> In the transcript there is a mark of interrogation over the word 'our' as if it was not quite legible.

stand—but I suppose we shall lose the season. Meanwhile we shall accumulate matter.

I do not see, do all I can, but the work will have a strong Roman effect—the times were Roman—(nor can we be protesting) and I fear in some writers the *tone* will be such too, do what I will. Altering will but mar, not undo. Now will you give me your opinion—which I always value very much.

As to myself, I don't like talking. When we meet, we shall see how we feel about it.

P.S.—I am much concerned to hear you talk of indisposition.

#### TO THE SAME

Oriel College : December 5, 1843.

I have just got your and Gladstone's letters, for which, and the promptitude which you and he have shown, I am very much obliged indeed. As to your *very* kind offer at the end, I cannot speak of it in such terms as I feel about it—but I do not think that the work *can* stop, nor do I indeed see what great advantage will come of much delay.

Your remarks I shall truly be obliged by your giving me—and I send you back the sheets for that purpose. I am sure no *intentional* attack on things as they are was in the wish of the writer.

G.'s remarks have shown me the *hopelessness* by delay, or any other means of escaping the disapprobation of a number of persons whom I very much respect.

P.S.—May I keep G.'s letter? I will not, unless you *fully* allow me. I am *very much* obliged to him.

#### TO THE SAME

Oriel College : December 11, 1843.

I got your letter last night and proceeded at once to act upon it. I altered nearly all the passages, though I acquiesced far more in your ecclesiastical than your theological objections. It seemed to me, that, considering the *tone* of

the whole composition, an alteration of the word (e.g.) 'merit' was like giving milk and water for a fit of the gout, while it destroyed its integrity, vigor, in a word its go.

This feeling so grew upon me this morning, in conjunction with what you reported of Gladstone's apprehensions, that I came to a resolve of abandoning the scheme *in toto*—and have acted upon it. I think I have a view, and have been happier than I have been about it for a long time.

Now don't you be hasty, and think that this is a great sacrifice, and that I am knocking under to people in authority, or to such men as Gladstone; no such thing. I can take no such credit to myself. I assure you, to find that the English Church cannot bear the Lives of her Saints (for so I will maintain, in spite of Gladstone, is the fact) does not tend to increase my faith and confidence in her. Nor am I abandoning *publication* because I abandon this particular measure. Rather, I consider I have been silent now for several years on subjects of the day, and need not fear now to speak.

I mean to publish now such Lives as are in type, or are written, but as separate works. If these gradually mount up towards the fulness of such an idea as the 'Lives of the Saints' contemplated, in progress of time, well and good. And now, as publishing them separately I have thought I might act more on my own judgement—and consequently, while I have thankfully kept the alterations on the point of 'exceptions' and 'impropriations,' which you have led me to make, I have put back again 'merit' &c. &c., alterations to which I submitted with a bad grace. I am convinced that those passages are *not* flying in persons' faces, but are parts of a whole, and express ideas which cannot *otherwise* be expressed. I have altered the first page about 'hopes for the future.'

Further I have serious thoughts of giving in to the idea which some people have, of setting up a review or something of the kind, and supporting it as well as I can. And I should

not be loth to discuss in *it* such questions as the Pope's supremacy.

Now the question is, what you have to say *generally* to such a course. I should like to know how it strikes you. And could you give me any hint about publishers? I suppose not. What strikes me at first, is to make overtures to some such man as Toovey, and bring him forward in our line. We *want* a man in our line.

Thanks for all the trouble you have taken.

TO THE SAME ]

Oriel College : December 16, 1843.

You have not understood me about Gladstone, doubtless through my own fault. The truth is, I am making a great concession—not to him, but to my respectful feelings towards him. I thought you could see it, and only feared you would think it greater than it really was. So I tried to put you on your guard.

1. I withdrew *my name* from *any plan*. This is no slight thing. I have frequent letters from people I do not know on the subject of the Lives of Saints, and doubt not it is raising much talk and interest. A name always gives point to an undertaking—considering my connection with the 'Tracts for the Times,' it would especially do this. You yourself and Badeley (whom please, thank, for some kind trouble he has been at about a book for me) said, 'Delay the plan, *for* you will be putting *yourself* at the head of the extreme party—the "B(ritish) C(ritic)" having stopped:' now, I am more than *delaying*, I am withdrawing my name. I am sure this is a great thing, even though my initials occurred to this or that life.

2. I have given up continuity, and that certain and promised. 128 pp. were to come out every month, and the work was to go on to the end, except as unforeseen accidents interfered (as they have). Now we know how difficult it is to keep people up to their work. The work is now left to the unpledged zeal of individuals. And there will be



nothing methodical or periodical in it to force itself upon people.

I do consider, then, I have given up a great deal. But what I have *not* given up is the *wish* that the work should be done; only I have put it under great disadvantages—so great that I think it never will be done—at the utmost fragments will be done—and that without method, precision, unity, and a name.

And why have I done this? 1. Sincerely because I thought both by heading it and by giving it system I should be administering a continual blister to the kind feelings toward me, and the conscientious views of persons I respect as I do G. I assure you it is no pleasant thing to me to lose their good opinion, though I can't expect much to keep it. 2. I fear to put up something the Bishops may aim at. I may be charged at, as the Tracts have been. Then I should be in a very false position. I must move forward or backward, and I dread compulsory moves. 3. What is the most immediate and practical point, I don't think I could get a publisher to take on him the *expenses* of a *series*, but few people would dread the risk of a single life of one or two hundred pages. Accordingly, I think I shall publish the one of which you saw a bit, at once, to see whether it sells. That I shall to a certain extent be connected with it, and that I shall aim at making it a series, is certain; and this, as I said, was my reason for warning you that I was not giving way to G. so fully as I appeared to be.

I will add as to yourself, that my distinction between your ecclesiastical and theological remarks were not a principle, with which I *started*. It was a reflection which came upon me on making an induction *after* I had thought on your objections one by one.

P.S.—I hope the danger of the 'Dublin' is passing away.

What set me most urgently on my present notice, was that *I could not help it*. Tho' I gave up the series, which I wished to do, *Lives remained* written or printed or promised, *which would appear anyhow*, or scarcely could not.

## TO THE SAME

December 19, 1843.

Do you know whether I have ever, that is, whether I have lately, for I suppose they are synonymous, taken the liberty of asking Gladstone's acceptance of any of my books? If you know nothing, and I think you would know if I had, will you send the inclosed to Rivington, (being so kind as to seal it) and make some speech to Gladstone for me?

P.S.—I have written very badly. The inclosed is to tell Rivington to send G. a copy of my Sermons 'from the Author.'

## ARCHDEACON MANNING TO J. H. NEWMAN

Lavington: Feast of St. Thomas [December 21], 1843.

My dear Newman,—Until an hour before I left London on Saturday I had intended to stay Monday in Oxford chiefly for the purpose of coming to Littlemore. I was obliged to go to London to meet a person whom I was preparing for confirmation the next day.

I have been reading your last volume of Sermons. What I felt in reading the 21st to the end of the book, I will not try to say. There are only two things I will notice. The end of Sermon XXIV. p. 430<sup>1</sup> is what I have been trying to say to others and to myself. You have said it in a way to which I can add nothing. If only this were ever kept alive I should feel that there is a hope of all good before us whatever be the chastisements and humiliation through which we reach it. I send you the enclosed, though I know you will find much to censure, because I do not wish you to think me other than I am, and because your words referred to above are what I was trying to say at p. 15 at the bottom. I know that I have omitted the adverse and counter view of our state—as I did the other day: and I have done so designedly because it seemed to me that so

<sup>1</sup> *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, p. 380. Uniform Edition.

many were labouring that side, and so few of those who acknowledge, and feel the evils were even alluding to the other. Men seemed to me to be growing slack and soured from a feeling of hopelessness, and to be irritated rather than stirred up to work. The other thing is what you say of Orpah at the bottom of p. 455.<sup>1</sup> I felt it bitterly from the thought that you might think my words the smooth words of one that would leave you for the world. I will use no professions of attachment to you, or of my own intentions and desires for myself. I had rather submit to any thoughts in your heart, or in others. You have a hard life and an empty home before you, and so have I, and I trust we shall walk together long enough to trust the singleness of each other's eye and to love each other as friends.

What I have gone through since I received your last letter you will know better than I can tell you. I have been overthrown by all manner of feelings: among which the thought that you have been grieved at me, or disappointed by me has made me have the saddest days I have known a long time.

My dear Newman, do not suspect me as an empty pretender if I say that the only thing that has kept me up in the last six years and more of trial, and the only thing I look for until death is to save the Church in which I was born again. Doubtful thoughts about it are dreadful—and seem to take all things from me.

I could not help writing this to you, for it has been in my mind day after day: and yet I have shrunk from doing it, until I read your words about Orpah. And after all I feel that all this may seem to you no better than her kiss.

May we be guided and kept from and against ourselves.

Believe me, my dear Newman,

Ever yours affectionately,

H. E. MANNING.

<sup>1</sup> *Ibid.* p. 402.

The Sermons spoken of are 'Sermons Bearing on Subjects of the Day.' Sermon XXIV is entitled 'Elijah the Prophet of the Latter Days.' The passage alluded to by Manning is the concluding paragraph. 'What want we then but faith in our church? . . . . If we have a secret misgiving about her, all is lost. . . . Let it not be so with us . . . let us accept her as God's gift and our portion; let us imitate him who, when he was, "by the bank of Jordan" took the mantle of Elijah, that fell from him, and smote the waters, and said, "Where is the Lord God of Elijah?" She is like the mantle of Elijah, a relic from Him who is gone up on high.' In the last phase of his Anglicanism Newman dwelt much on Elijah, the prophet sent to the schismatical kingdom of Israel (see 'Apologia,' pp. 152-154). In a visitation charge delivered the previous July Archdeacon Manning had said, 'The first condition of our usefulness at this day is this,—a steadfast and thorough faith in the life and truth of the Church of England,' &c.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO ARCHDEACON MANNING

December 24, 1843.

My dear Manning,—How can I thank you enough for your most kind letter received last night?—and what can have led you to entertain the thought that I could ever be crossed by the idea which you consider may have been suggested to me by the name of Orpah? Really, unless it were so sad a matter, I should smile; the thought is as far from me as the Antipodes. Rather I am the person who to myself always seem, and reasonably, the criminal; I cannot afford to have hard thoughts which can more plausibly be exercised against myself. And yet to speak of myself, how could I have done otherwise than I have done or better? I own indeed to great presumption and recklessness in my work of writing on ecclesiastical subjects, on various occasions, yet still I have honestly trusted our Church and wished to defend her as she wishes to be defended. I wasn't surely wrong in defending her on that basis which our divines have ever built and on which alone they can pretend to build. And how could I foresee that when I examined that basis I should feel it to require a

system different from hers and that the Fathers to which she led me would lead me from her? I do not see then that I have been to blame; yet it would be strange if I had heart to blame others who are honest in maintaining what I am abandoning.

It is no pleasure to me to differ from friends—no comfort to be estranged from them—no satisfaction or boast to have said things which I must unsay. Surely I will remain where I am as long as I can. I think it right to do so. If my misgivings are from above, I shall be carried on in spite of my resistance. I cannot regret in time to come having struggled to remain where I found myself placed. And believe me, the circumstance of such men as yourself being contented to remain is the strongest argument in favour of my own remaining. It is my constant prayer, that if others are right I may be drawn back—that nothing may part us.

Thank you for your charge and the passage you point out. I was pleased to see the coincidence between us.

I am, my dear Manning,

Ever yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

This letter was also sent to Gladstone, who made the following suggestions in a letter to Manning dated December 31.<sup>1</sup> Could Manning by a discreet use of his knowledge influence some of the Bishops in the direction of being more moderate in their charges? 'Are there any Bishops—I think there must be many—who believe that the event we know to be possible would be, to the Church, an inexpressible calamity? These are the men whom to contemplate in any practical measure.' Newman might be warned 'of the immense consequences that may hang upon his movements.' 'Cords of silk should one by one be thrown over him to bind him to the Church. Every manifestation of sympathy and confidence in him, as a man, must have some small effect.' This last suggestion shows that Gladstone had got rid of the unfavourable impression made upon his mind by his misunderstanding of the second of Newman's letters to Manning.

<sup>1</sup> Lathbury, *Letters and Correspondence on Church and Religion of W. E. Gladstone*, vol. i. pp. 290 ff.

## CHAPTER VIII

### IN RETIREMENT

'I come, O mighty Mother! I come, but I am far from home. Spare me a little; I come with what speed I may, but I am slow of foot, and not as others, O mighty Mother!'

DURING the year 1844 Newman was still busy with his *St. Athanasius*. The brief introductory note to the second volume of the 'Select Treatises' &c., merely saying, 'The Preliminary Matter is unavoidably postponed,' is dated December 6. In regard to his doubts, he seems almost to have given up struggling against them, but he did nothing to bring them to an issue till the beginning of 1845, when he set to work upon his *Essay on Development*. He was contented to wait, looking on, it might almost be said like a passive spectator, at the workings of his own mind. Meanwhile he was glad that his state of unsettlement should gradually become known, for he did not wish that people should go on pinning their faith to him, or that there should be any panic and confusion if eventually he did leave the Church of England. In July a Bishop announced gleefully that 'The adherents of Mr. Newman are few in number. A short time will now suffice to prove this fact. It is well known that he is preparing for secession; and, when that event takes place, it will be seen how few will go with him.' *Sumus homines mortales . . . lutea vasa portantes, quae faciunt invicem angustias. Sed si angustiantur vasa carnis, dilatentur spatia caritatis*—the spaces of charity in the Bishop's breast might have been widened had there been someone to tell him that if Mr. Newman's adherents were few in number, it was so by Mr. Newman's deliberate choice and act. The distress he was causing his friends, the discomfiture of those who had loyally stood by him in the matter of Tract 90, pierced Newman to the heart; and he was not wholly insensible to a feeling of personal humiliation at having to admit that he had changed his opinions. But all

this was nothing compared with the thought that he was doing the very thing which of all others he most hated—unsettling men's religious convictions. The theory of the Via Media elaborated in the Prophetic Office of the Church and others of his writings, had satisfied the reason and conscience of thousands who before were without much definite religious belief. Now he was telling them that it was untenable. Who could estimate the effect of such a shock upon their minds? How many, their first great venture of faith having been brought to naught, must be led to despair of ever finding religious truth, and even though they made no change of profession would have their spiritual life numbed by uncertainty and doubt?

The reader will probably like to know how Newman's days were passed during these times of perplexity. Some interesting documents concerning his life at Littlemore have fortunately been preserved. One is a time-table jotted down on a half-sheet of notepaper in 1842:

5-6½ Matins and Lauds <sup>1</sup>	3-3¾ Evening Prayers—
6½-7 Breakfast.	Chapel. <sup>2</sup>
7-7½ Prime.	3¾-4½ Recreation.
7½-10 Study, etc., with Tierce.	4½-6 Study, etc., with None.
10-11 Morning Prayers—Chapel. <sup>2</sup>	6-6½ Supper.
11-2 Study, etc., with Sext.	6½-7½ Recreation.
2-3 Recreation.	7½-9½ Study, etc.
	9½-10 Vespers.
	10-10¼ Compline.
	10¼-5 Sleep, etc.

No talking except between 2 and 7½.

Summary

Devotions . . . . .	4½ hrs.
Study . . . . .	9
Meals . . . . .	1
Recreation . . . . .	2¾
Sleep . . . . .	6¾

---

24

<sup>1</sup> For the Divine Office the Roman Breviary was used; but the Antiphons of our Lady were conscientiously omitted as containing direct Invocation; which was not sanctioned by the English Church.

<sup>2</sup> *I.e.* the Anglican Service at the public chapel.

This is how Lent was kept at Littlemore in 1844. It was 'lighter this year.'

'1. We have eaten no flesh meat (including suet) on Sundays or week-days.

'2. We have not broken fast till 12.

'3. At 12 we have taken a slice of bread. The full meal at 5—but we had the choice (which perhaps we never used) of taking the full meal at 12, and the bread at 5.

'4. There was no restriction on tea at any hour early or late.

'5. Nor [at the full meal] on butter, sugar, salt, fish, etc. Wine on Sundays.'

'I have not,' he added, 'felt any rule so light since I have attempted anything. This I attribute to drinking very freely of tea, as early as 8 or 9 A.M. with sugar in it. I am told I do not look ill.'

It must be remembered that Newman and his friends were reviving the discipline of fasting. They had to ascertain what was practicable by actual experience.

They went into retreat twice a year, in Lent and in Advent, for seven days.<sup>1</sup> Newman made notes of the various meditations, how he had got on with them, what thoughts and practical resolutions they suggested to him, &c. He kept his mind rigidly fixed on the subject of the meditation. Only once, and then it was quite in order, does the subject of his religious doubts come up. 'I renewed my surrender of myself in all things to God, to do with me what He would at any cost. Various great trials struck me.' He enumerated four, and added, 'I considered that God is used to accept offers, but, I trust, he will not exact such.' One of these 'great trials' was 'having to join the Church of Rome.'<sup>2</sup>

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

January 22, 1844.

My very dear Newman,—It is a longful time since we had any communication, and something within me tells

<sup>1</sup> They used the Exercises of St. Ignatius, or books based upon them.

<sup>2</sup> The reader who is puzzled at the frame of mind which made such a prayer possible should study Sermons XXI–XXIV, in the volume *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, especially the one entitled 'Elijah the Prophet of the Latter Days,' where much is made of the fact that the Prophet did not bid the ten schismatical tribes return to their allegiance to Judah, and worship God in Jerusalem. While he was still in perplexity, Newman seems almost unconsciously to have looked upon a call to join the Church as something like a special vocation.



me, it is a heartless thing to let a Christmas and New Year come and go, and not say one word to you, to whom under God one is indebted for so very much of the comfort and hope which they have been allowed to bring with them. Whether one is deceiving one's self or not, who can tell? . . . but, still, so it is, that, in spite of perplexities, I do not know when a year has passed over my head, on the whole, with so much of peace, as this last. May it only not prove a delusion!

And you, dear friend, in the meantime, what have you not been undergoing, and little have I felt for you in comparison of what you felt and did for me; and even now I very much fear, from two or three sadly toned sentences in Pusey's last letters (though he neither names nor describes anyone) that your troubles are unassuaged. . . . I think and think, it seems all to no purpose; for when I come to set it down, it will be only telling you over again what you have yourself told me and others. These, however, are some of my impressions:—

First, I feel more strongly with every month's, week's, day's experience, the danger of tempting God, and the deep responsibility I should have to bear, were I to forsake this communion; and yet with the same lapse of time one seems to feel more and more the truth and beauty and majesty of so much which they have and we seem at least to have not.

Secondly, one is at times very, very strongly impressed with the thought of the Evil One, how surely he would endeavour to ruin the good work, supposing it begun, in the English Church, by laying hold of any undiscerned weakness or ill tendency in the agents to entice or drive them out of it. Such tendencies one can imagine in your case; among the rest a certain restlessness, a longing after something more, something analogous to a very exquisite ear in music, which would keep you, I should think, in spite of yourself, intellectually and morally dissatisfied wherever you were. If you were in a convent, you would be *forced* to subdue it, and, as it were, swallow it down; may it not perhaps be your calling now to do the same, though under no such definite rule, for others' sake as well as your own? May it

not be your duty, according to your own line of argument just made public, to suppress your misgivings, nay what seem your intellectual convictions, as you would any other bad thoughts, making up your mind that the conclusion is undutiful, and therefore there must be some delusion in the premisses ?

Another thought one has is of the utter confusion and perplexity, the astounding prostration of heart and mind, into which so many would be thrown, were their guide and comforter to forsake them all at once, in the very act, as it would seem to them, of giving them directions which they most needed. I really suppose that it would be to *thousands* quite an indescribable shock, a trial almost too hard to be borne, making them sceptical about everything and everybody.

Surely, when it is a person's duty (as St. Paul's) to take such a step as that, the tokens from above will be such (one naturally expects,) as no one could mistake ; and may we not piously believe, that, where it is the will of Divine Providence that such persons as Pusey (for example) should leave their present communion, something equivalent to the Voice will occur, such as an *unequivocal* act of heresy on the part of our Church, leaving no doubt on the mind ; and that, till such tokens are given, it is His will men should stay where they are. I am running on, I fear, not very wisely ; and I wish I may not be distressing you ; but, if I could express myself better, I believe I really mean what I have learned from yourself.

And another thought, which has been much on my mind lately, and which I mentioned to Oakeley the other day in reference to his plan about St. Bernard, is, *If* the Medieval system is really the intended development of Primitive Catholicity, is it not the most natural way for the English Church to recover it *through* Primitive Catholicity, instead of being urged directly to it ; and therefore even on medieval principles are we not doing the best in confining ourselves for the present to those things in which the earlier Church is unquestionably with us ? I do not know whether this is

worth anything ; but I put down whatever occurs to me ; and as far as I see at present, this would be a safe and dutiful rule with regard to the English Church, yet ample and large enough for far more improvement than the most sanguine dare expect in our time.

I am writing in great ignorance, and very likely quite beside the mark. If I pain or disturb you, forgive me. Somehow or other I was almost forced to write. You know I see you looking at me day after day, and I *must* speak to you now and then ; and, when I speak, I must say what is in my head. May it do no harm, if it does no good. I am sure my account is heavy enough without that.

Wilson seems *steadily* better ; and I am in great hopes that he will be able to stay with us comfortably. Do not trouble yourself to write to me, except, when you can do it conveniently and without irksomeness, and do not speak of things which perhaps you had rather not. I wish you may be able to report well of your sister and of Bowden. My brother is better than he was—but yet I fear decidedly not quite well.

Ever and ever I hope,

Your affectionate and grateful,

J. K.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore : January 23, 1844.

My dear Keble,—It is not for want of thinking of you and meaning to write to you that I keep silent, but I have so great a reluctance to take up my pen, though I have long owed you a letter—and I do not know how to talk about myself, even for fear of saying not [what ?] is not exact about my feelings, of saying what is unreal and the like. Yet I do owe you a letter and mean some time to pay it.

More thanks to you than I can give, for your present most kind letter, which is just like you. Thanks for what you tell me about yourself, and thanks for your kind anxiety about me.

I am in no distress of mind at present—that is, whatever is truth, and whatever is not, I do not feel called to do anything but go on where I am, and this must be peace and quietness—and whatever is before us, in this one may rejoice, and not take thought for the morrow. I fear I must say I have a steadily growing conviction about the English Church—you will understand what I mean—and this I think without any effort of mine. The early Church has all along been my line of study—and I am still occupied upon it. For some time, I suppose, I shall be upon 'the Arians' and the second part of the volume of St. Athanasius. It is this line of reading, and no other, which has led me Romeward. Not that I read it with that view.

I wish to resist, as I always have—and think it a duty. I am sure, *if* it be right to go forward, I shall be forced on in spite of myself. Somehow I cannot feel the question of dutifulness so strongly as it is sometimes put. Was it undutifulness to the Mosaic Law, to be led on to the Gospel? was not the Law from God? How could a Jew, formerly or now, ever become a Christian, if he must at all hazards resist convictions and for ever? How could a Nestorian or Monophysite join the Catholic Church but by a similar undutifulness?

What I wish is, not to go by my own judgment, but by something external, like the pillar of the cloud in the desert. Such is the united movement of *many*. The publishing those Sermons is like Gideon's fleece. If it were permanently to stop people, this would have a great influence on me. I should think there was something *real* in the view. What I fear is, that they are only ingenious; but the event alone can show this, and it seemed to me right to make the experiment, that is, rather, burying what might be a talent *not* to publish them [*sic*]. A simple-hearted and clever young woman, who had been perplexed with doubts about Rome, on reading my *University Sermons*, suddenly rose from her chair and said 'This is what I wanted, this satisfies me.' *How* they satisfied her I have no notion, or whether they will eventually.

But still if this kind of effect did follow from what I had written, (or from what anyone else wrote) it would tend greatly to convince me that my duty was where I am. On the other hand I must not conceal, that letters, which I receive continually from persons whom I know and whom I know not, show me that a movement is going on in cases which are little suspected and in minds which are struggling against it.

Everything is hid from us as to the effect of things. People are unsettled as it is. As years go on, they either will become settled, or they will be gradually more and more unsettled. If *my* thoughts had been led through the early Church to Rome, why should not others? We know nothing of the effects of one's own hypothetical acts. There have been events ten thousand times more unsettling than the change of individuals now. St. Paul must have unsettled all the good and conscientious people in the Jewish Church. Unsettling may be a blessing, even where minds are *not* already unsettled.

I hope I am not wrong, but I have lately been praying that 'if *I* am right, Pusey, Manning etc. may be brought forward; but if Pusey, Manning etc. are right, I may be brought back—that nothing, if it be possible, may separate us.'

One thing I will add—I sometimes have uncomfortable feelings as if I should not like to die in the English Church. It seems to me that, while Providence gives one time, it is even a call upon one to make use of it *in* deliberateness and waiting—but that, did He cut short one's hours of grace, this would be a call to make up one's mind on what seemed most probable.

I have written all this, as it occurred to me, only that you might see my state of mind—not in the way of argument.

I wish I could sufficiently thank you for, or duly feel, the kindness of your letter. May God bless you for it.

What you told me about Wilson was a great relief—Bowden, thank God, is certainly better. It *looks* as if a crisis were passed, but we must be cautious in speaking.

I wish my sister were really better, but her recovery will be very slow.

Ever yours most affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

February 21, 1844.

I must write one line to you this day, because it is the 21st of February,<sup>1</sup> and who is more bound than I to remember you with all manner of good wishes? May this Lent be blessed and peaceful to you, and to the many who more or less have been caused by Providence to depend on you.

I have hardly time to say more; but, as a second edition of your new Sermons is advertised, I will mention an erratum which my wife has observed; in p. 150 line 16 'The flood of God's grace keeps it level.' Should it not be 'its level'? It is a little thing to be sure.

Another thought which has come into my mind on reading your 15th Sermon<sup>2</sup> is about the application of the second commandment, which one would expect to be as literal as that of the fourth. And, if it be so, is it not a caution against the authorised practice of the greater part of Christendom? And, if this be so, would it now be well to mention it somewhere in the Sermon or in a note?

Ever your thankful and affectionate,

J. KEBLE.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore: Feb. 26/44.

My dear Keble,—Thanks for your kind remembrance and thoughts of me on the 21st.

The second Edition of my Sermons has been out some

<sup>1</sup> Newman's birthday.

<sup>2</sup> In *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*.

time. I am vexed that the misprint you notice should be in two Editions.

As to the second Commandment, with reference to Sermon 15, I have been accustomed to think that in the words 'Thou shalt not make to thyself' the force of the sentence lies in 'to thyself.' The sin was not in bowing down to a created emblem of the Creator, but to a self-devised emblem. In Exodus xxxiii. 10, the people fall down before the cloudy pillar as the token of the unseen God. They were told in like manner to look upon the Brazen Serpent in order that they might live. On the other hand that the fault lay in the 'making to *themselves*' emblems is implied in Amos v. 26 (so also Acts vii. 43) where *vid.* St. Jerome's comment, and in Deut. iv. 15-18 the fault is making to themselves a likeness which they had no means divinely provided of making; 'Ye saw no similitude.' And so Jeroboam sacrificed 'unto the calves which *he had made*' 'in the month which he had *devised of his own heart.*' The same emphasis occurs in Judges xviii. I should say then, if asked, that the sin denounced in the second Commandment is *unauthorised worship*. That Protestants are in many ways guilty of this sin is evident; indeed they would *confess* that they act of their own minds, and would count it a part of their Christian freedom, liberty of conscience etc. to do so. Whether the Greek and Latin Churches are guilty of it or not, at least they deny it, and say that the Church has the divinely granted right of innovating or adding in matters of ceremony and worship, (whether this is true or not). From what Palmer of Magdalen says, one should fear that the Russian lower classes do almost worship graven images. I suppose they are much lower and more ignorant than the R. Catholics—except indeed in places half heathen, as in South America.

What has been argued above about the words 'to thyself' seems to fit in to what forms one main part of the Sermon in question; the principle that Scripture prohibitions are not simple prohibitions but *secundum quid*. The Sabbath is done away, not *simpliciter*, but *as* a carnal

ordinance. I recollect as long ago as 1834, long before I felt the force of the argument for Rome, being perplexed at seeing that the same distinction which enabled us to condemn circumcision as a carnal ordinance yet to maintain baptism, would avail for the *cultus imaginum*, as if it was forbidden to the Jews because the heathen images were carnal, likenesses of devils, etc. etc., which is not the case with the images of Saints. But enough of this.

Ever yours very affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

February 29, 1844.

I have had several letters lately from \_\_\_\_\_ and to-day met him at Winchester at his request, and (this is in confidence) I fear it is too plain . . . that his mind is seriously affected. . . . He is likely enough to be attacking you . . .

. . . I dare say you are sufficiently pestered with remarks on your publications, but I will mention what occurs to me without scruple, because I know you will not be affronted at them, and I shall not be affronted, if you take no notice of them.

I will just say then 1. that I should like the passage to be a little more guarded, in which you speak of our Lord eating and drinking *in appearance at least*, p. 32,<sup>1</sup> because it is a passage which sets persons thinking 'What possibly *can* he mean?' And some will think irreverently, some with a perplexed fear of irreverence; while you, I dare say, with a word or two could make the whole matter comparatively clear.

Thank you for your reply to my question about the second Commandment. I should not doubt the correctness of the view, as being at least a great part of the meaning of the Commandment. Still, if we make it *the* meaning, will it not strike most persons as partaking very much of the

<sup>1</sup> P. 28 in Uniform Edition, where the clause 'in His own words' is substituted to meet Keble's objection.



same kind of subtlety which you complain of in some expositions of the fourth?

I think I ought to add, that I have had it remarked to me by one whose opinion on these matters I think you would value, that the tone of this your last volume is in general, from whatever cause, more positive and dogmatic than the former ones; sometimes, it was hinted, quite startling, from the determinate way in which so and so is laid down to be the only possible sense of Scripture in such and such places. This was what I understood to be meant, and I thought it on the whole as well that you should know that such a thought came into the mind of a considerate person, and one greatly disposed to defer to every word of yours.<sup>1</sup>

I am very sorry to understand from letters of Pusey's, that he is greatly pained at the unreserved way in which some of our friends are going on to recommend the whole of the Roman devotional system, especially as regards St. Mary. Surely, they can hardly know how much he suffers by it: else, it is indeed a heavy responsibility they take on them.

The thought will always recur that I have no right to write like this on these matters; but, however, I *have* written, and you will kindly bear with me, I am sure of *that*. Therefore do not tax yourself to write any sooner than is quite convenient. There seems a chance of my coming up before long about this Divinity Statute.

Ever your thankful and affectionate,

J. KEBLE.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore: March 2, /44.

My dear K.,—Your remark about A. P. P. quite confirms what, alas, I guessed. I am truly grieved at it.

Thank you for your question about my positiveness. It is meant for my own consideration, I know; and I should

<sup>1</sup> In the copy which he made of Keble's letters before he parted with the originals, Newman wrote in the margin of this paragraph, '*Vid.* letter of Sept. 4, 1843, about Knox.'

not speak about it, except that I am so little conscious of it, and for other reasons think it so far from the case, that I wish you to get some *instances* specified which I may think about. I have observed, that whenever a reader agrees or is not startled, he sees nothing positive in what he *would* call positive, were it new to him or questionable. Not that I mean to say that I am *not* positive in this last volume—but I think I am positive in the *others* quite as much i.e. sententious. The 'other reason' I allude to is this—that the Sermons have been written at very different times in the course of the last twelve years, and have not much been altered for publication—one was written in 1832, two 1836, two in 1838, ten in 1840-41—only seven out of twenty-six in 1843. And they were written *among* other sermons. I do not think then they are likely to be marked by any character of mind which does not attach to *all* my Sermons.

Thank you also for what you say about p. 32. I have looked at it—but you must kindly state more definitely what you mean when you next write, since at present I do not get into your idea enough to alter the passage by it.

If you allude to R. Williams and his Breviary plan as paining Pusey, I really know very little about it. I believe he is content to wait *any time*, but does not like to publish it with alterations or what he would call mutilations—and that from reverence for the Breviary. Perhaps I ought to add, though it will pain you, that for myself I have no difficulty in the Breviary *in toto*, though you are the first person to whom I say so.

It comes into my head you may mean Oakeley's plan of translating St. Bernard. I wish I had had any idea that P's feeling was what you represent, since I would not have subscribed to it. As it is, my name, I believe, is in print. My opinion about the publication was not asked—and since I saw the Prospectus, what I have said has been to throw cold water upon it.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. N.

P.S.—I am tempted to quote your own words about my p. 32 'What possibly *can* he mean?' I have not a dream of what you are alluding to or think I had in mind. By 'in appearance at least' I mean our Lord's saying that He 'came eating and drinking,' or *if not*, yet this was what people *thought* of Him, as He did not come with St. John's visible austerity. I neither meant more than this, nor can I conceive what or why people should think I meant more.

*Sunday*.—I have just seen the 'B. Mag.' which also alludes to these words. Nothing but the extreme sensitiveness and nervousness of people (which I cannot of course wonder at) could so extort a hidden meaning out of plain words. I suppose my best course in another edition is to leave out 'at least in outward appearance.' I put them in, as feeling it irreverent to say our Lord came 'eating and drinking' as if it implied that He was a 'wine-bibber.'

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

March 3, 1844.

I shall not be able to reply to all your note this evening, but I will say a word or two.

With regard to the words in p. 32, my saying people would say 'What *can* he mean?' (which I am sorry for, fearing that it has pained you) I merely meant that they would be perplexed to know what the meaning was—not that they would put a bad meaning, as the 'B(ritish) M(aga-zine)' probably has, and as another journal, first cousin to it, I know has. I myself put the same meaning to the words which you do, but I do not think this would strike every reader, because, the words which are qualified being our Saviour's own, it would not strike them that they needed qualification, and they would be looking out for some other meaning.

Pusey is certainly *perplexed* by what R. Williams has lately written about the Breviary, because it seems

to him and to me also not quite to agree with what he wrote to me before; but I think his, R. Ws', feeling very natural and would not on any account press him against it. Pray tell P. this, if the subject is started between you, for I have just been writing to him and have not sufficiently expressed this. Of course Williams' drawing back is about as great a check to us as we could have, but it would be exceedingly painful, had he given way and repented afterwards. I don't think P. in what he wrote to me was thinking either of him or of Oakeley's St. Bernard, but rather of a plan which he hears Mr. Christie (Albany) has of publishing the 'Paradisus Animæ' entire (I conclude in English) as also the 'Horæ Diurnæ.'

For my own part, until I could be convinced that this Church has no authority, I seem to see my way clearly thus far, that I ought to lay myself out upon those additions to her system and ritual which I am *sure* are in Antiquity, such as Monasticism, Prayers for the Dead, etc., rather than upon those which by consent of all parties were not developed till afterwards.

I should have been pained, I dare say, at what you say of your feeling about the Breviary, had I not supposed from former letters that you had laid aside your objections. My grand swallow of pain on the subject was perhaps three quarters of a year ago, when I received a long letter of yours and retired into a deserted old chalk pit to read it. I cannot tell you with what sort of fancy I look at the place now.

About the positiveness I cannot say much just now. The impression was that in the manner of quoting Scripture this sort of form occurred continually, 'Such a text cannot mean anything but so and so.' It had not struck the person before, and was not now connected with any particular difference of opinion. I will apply for instances.<sup>1</sup>

Ever your affectionate and grateful,

J. K.

<sup>1</sup> (I never got any—and don't think they were to be found. The instances ought to have gone originally *with* the charge. It illustrates how coloured from this time the views were of me, and my words and deeds.—J. H. N.)

Newman was continually being asked to contradict reports that he had left the Church of England.

A CLERGYMAN TO J. H. NEWMAN

March 11, 1844.

Reverend Sir,—A Revd. H. Stowell, perhaps unknown to you, 'President of the Manchester and Salford Protestant and Reformation Society,' has publicly and distinctly stated that 'Mr. Newman has been obliged to leave the Church of England and go over to Rome.' I enclose the extract from his speech. Would you be kind enough to say for your own sake, and for our satisfaction, whether this be so. Whether or not you hold the 'Cure of Souls' at Littlemore in the Diocese of Oxford. This would be a sufficient answer. As the statement has been publicly made at the Annual Meeting of the Reformation Society, I trust, if it is untrue, you will allow me to give it a public contradiction through the same medium in which it has been circulated. I know this may be painful to you, but the case requires such a procedure.

Yours most respectfully, etc.

J. H. NEWMAN TO A CLERGYMAN

March 12/44.

Dear Sir,—I beg to thank you for your note just received, and the extract enclosed in it from a speech ascribed to a clergyman who is President of the Manchester and Salford Protestant and Reformation Society.

In answer to your question whether I do not 'hold and serve the Cure of Souls at Littlemore in the Diocese of Oxford,' I have to inform you that I am not in the discharge of any duties whatsoever in the Church of England.

And in answer to your request that I would publicly contradict the statement contained in the speech above referred to, that 'Mr. Newman has been obliged to leave the Church of England, and go over to Rome,' I observe that this statement has no foundation whatever in fact.

Thanking you for the kindness which has prompted your note,

I am, etc.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

Littlemore: March 14th, 1844.

My dear Hope,—I ought to have answered your question before now. As to our Guest Chamber, it is quite at your service—but your question has somewhat fidgetted me, lest you should expect more than you actually ask about. Pray do not fancy us in such a state that we can profess a retreat, or anyone here able to conduct one. It has been our object among ourselves to attempt something of the sort several times, but (what may make you smile from its absurdity) *without* a director *because* we did not know where to go for one. And as to Passion week, we were obliged to take it last year from circumstances, and found it not fitted for anything so exhausting as a series of meditations—i.e. we rather overdid matters. I cannot then promise anything but a room where you may be your own master and have no one interfering with you—but so much I will gladly promise. Or if you wish a lodging *in* Littlemore, as being more quiet than Oxford, that I can easily get you.

I have nothing to tell you about my own concerns. St. Stephen is liked much, and thought moderate. The Family of St. Richard, our next, is somewhat stronger and not so interesting, but very practical. I am rather anxious about it. We have several good ones coming afterwards, none very strong, but I shall not know much about them, as time goes on. I am glad that Gladstone is pleased with what I did. I did all I could *under* my then engagements and promises. Had such opinions as his and Pusey's happened to come sooner, I should have given up the whole plan. At the same time I do not think I have more than thrown it back, and *when* it revives, of course it will be in less safe hands than mine. Also, G. ought to be aware, as I daresay he is, that a series of thwartings such as I have experienced, (I do not mean, creates, which logically they cannot do) but realizes, verifies, substantizes, a *φαντασία* of the English Church very unfavourable to her Catholicity.

If a person is deeply convinced in his *reason* that her claims to Catholicity are untenable, but fears to trust his reason, such events, when they come upon him again and again, seem to do just what is wanting, corroborate his reason experimentally. They force upon his imagination and familiarize his moral perception with the conclusions of his intellect. Propositions become facts.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. W. DODSWORTH

Littlemore : March 18, 1844.

It is not easy to return an answer to your question. In matter of fact we are full here, but I suppose we might make more room—but under the circumstances great caution is necessary for the sake of all parties in forming such relations as you speak of with anyone. I say under the circumstances, for I suppose, had we any right to be considered what we are aiming at, we should be wrong to consult personal feelings and likings, or to be guided by knowledge of individuals, &c. I suppose a religious house ought frankly to receive anyone who shows himself in earnest, without respect of persons. But this presupposes a state of things very different from that under which we find ourselves. The principle of obedience does not exist in our Church—i.e. (as regards a religious House) the principle of assimilation, or a digestive power. We have no head to whom obedience is due. We have no ecclesiastical authority, no episcopal blessing. We have no vows, obliging persons to be resigned, when the spirit or flesh rebels. We have no sacramental services, compensating for hardships, relieving the dreariness or monotony (as some would find it) of a retreat. For all these reasons it seems allowable or necessary to pick and choose our associates, and to make personal attachment the principle of admission. Else the whole attempt would be upset. Nor am I speaking merely theoretically. You see then I can return no answer to your question.

One thing, I think, we seem to be agreed upon—though I should not like it mentioned—to make sacramental confession a *sine qua non* among those who belong to us—and as there is more than one priest here, this does not involve any general subjection to one person.

Perceval called on me here. He had sent me a letter in the beginning of February, from which I inferred too truly how it was with him. He since has asked for it back—so I suppose means to publish it. It will not strike others however.

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

Oriel: May 14th, 1844.

Your change of intention surprised, and did not quite please me, I mean I could not help fearing it might in part be owing to something I told you about myself.

Yet I do not know how I can repent of having spoken to you. To have kept silence for five years, is giving oneself a long probation. If my confidence in myself bore any proportion to the strength of my persuasion, I should not be where I am, but I know that, the more free I may be (if so) from the influence of ordinary wrong motives, so I may be warped without knowing it by some more subtle bias.

I thought over the question you put to me, and the only additional remark I had to make, was one I should have mentioned to you the first time I wrote, though it did not alter my conclusion, viz. I thought there might be this danger in your accepting the offices you have declined:—It seems to me that your tendency is to view things as a great scheme or game, and that when you once were in it, the fact that you were engaged *in* a game would have exerted a bias to keep you in it, even when reason &c. spoke differently.

And now, in mentioning this peculiarity which I think I partly see in you, you will understand what I mean above



by alluding to the possibility of unknown biases in *myself*, which, if they exist, I would fain detect. I am not conscious of the one I have just mentioned.

Ever yours sincerely,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO MR. SERJEANT BELLASIS

Littlemore : June 8, 1844.

I am much provoked with myself that, when I saw you yesterday morning, I did not thank you for your kind note sometime since about the Life of St. Stephen. At this time I meant to have written to you—then, I resolved to thank you the first opportunity; that opportunity having slipt me, I now write. Your letter was the first opinion I had had upon it, and very acceptable it was. The second edition is now almost running out—and there is appearance of a third being probable.

Had I any leisure when I was in London, I should have attempted the pleasure of calling on you, but I went up on a sort of business, and was kept to my work, such as it was.

Do not think me rude to direct to you 'Esqr.'—I do not know what the etiquette is.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore : June 8, /44.

My dear Keble,—Pattison wishes me to tell you that friends of his, a lady and daughter, are going into your Parish. So far you must know—at least you know *them*, and have been civil to them already—but what you do not know, and he wishes you to know, is, that they have come to Hursley to be 'under your superintendence.' I do not know what the phrase means, but when he and I had repeated it several times, and no light seemed thrown upon it, I dropped the subject. Perhaps he does not know either. If you wish, I can inquire.

I ought to take this opportunity of writing to you a

long letter, to which I have a great repugnance because it is about myself—not to say that writing intelligibly makes my hand ache. But you should know my state of mind—and though the disgust of writing, and the thought of the worry and worse that my letters give you, almost deter me, and I don't know how I shall get on, I will attempt to do it.

I have thought much lately of the words in Bishop Andrewes' Morning Prayer—'Despise not the work of Thine own hands'—he repeats it in various forms, as addressed to Each of the Persons of the Most Holy Trinity. May I not take comfort in this plea which they contain? 'Thine Hands have made me and fashioned me.' I look back to past years, or rather to all my years since I was a boy, and I say, 'Is it come to this? has God forgotten to be gracious? would He have led me on so far to cast me off? what have I done to be given over, if it be such, to a spirit of delusion? where is my fault? which has been the false step, if such there be?'

I know He taketh up and setteth down—and of course I know that I have done enough to provoke Him to give me over and to deserve all that is evil. But still such is not His way, and I cannot get myself to believe that He means evil towards me, yet month by month my convictions grow in one direction.

When I was a boy of fifteen, and living a life of sin, with a very dark conscience and a very profane spirit, He mercifully touched my heart; and, with innumerable sins, yet I have not forsaken Him from that time, nor He me. He has upheld me to this hour, and I have called myself His servant. When I came up to reside at Trinity, this verse of the Psalms, which was most in my heart and on my lips, and it has brought tears into my eyes to think of it, was 'Thou shalt guide me with Thy counsel,' etc. He then brought me through numberless trials safely and happily on the whole—and why should He now leave me to a blinded mind? I know I have done enough to provoke Him; but will He?

He led me forward by a series of Providences from the age of nineteen till twenty-seven. I *was* 'the work of His hands,' for He repeatedly and variously chastised me and at last to win me from the world, He took from me a dear sister—and just at the same time He gave me kind friends to teach me His way more perfectly.

Time went on, and various things happened by which He went on training me—but what most impresses itself upon me, is the strange feelings and convictions about His will towards me which came on me, when I was abroad. When I went down to Sicily by myself, I had a strong idea that He was going to effect some purpose by me. And from Rome I wrote to some one, I think Christie, saying I thought I was to be made something of in His Hands, 'though, if not, the happier for me.' And when I was in Sicily by myself, it seemed as if some one were battling against me, and the idea has long been in my mind, though I cannot say when it came on, that my enemy was then attempting to destroy me. A number of sins were committed<sup>1</sup> in the very act of my going down by *myself*—to say nothing else, I was wilful, and neglected warnings—from that time everything went wrong. As I lay ill at Leonforte, before I got to Castro Giovanni, while I was laid up, I felt this strongly. My servant thought I was dying—but I expected to recover, and kept saying, as giving the reason, 'I have not sinned against light.' I had the fullest persuasion I should recover, and think I then gave as the reason, that some work was in store for me. But any how when I was getting up again, after it was over, this feeling was strong upon me, I recollect, when travelling down the country from Castro G. to Palermo, (the ecclesiastical year was on the same days as this year, and as the year of my getting in to Oriel, so that Rogers and I were both elected on the 12th of April) it must have been Whitsunday or Monday morning, sitting on my bed as I was dressing, and crying profusely. My servant, who was obliged to help me from my great weakness (for I could not walk by myself) of course

<sup>1</sup> 'Involved' is written over 'committed.'

could not think the meaning of it—and I could but say to him, what was quite as unintelligible as my tears, that I thought God had some work for me. And then when I got to England, the very first Sunday after my arrival (July 14) you preached your sermon on National Apostasy, which was the beginning of the movement.

And now at the end of eleven years from that time, was [what] is my own state? why, that for the last five years (almost) of it, I have had a strong feeling, often rising to an habitual conviction, though in the early portion of it after a while dormant, but very active now for two years and a half, and growing more urgent and imperative continually, that the Roman Communion is the only true Church. And this conviction came upon me while I was reading the Fathers and from the Fathers—and when I was reading them theologically, not ecclesiastically, in that particular line of study, that of the ancient heresies, to which circumstances, external to myself, had led me fourteen years ago, before the movement began.

And when this trial came upon me, I told only two persons with whom I happened to be at the time—and set myself to resist the impression. As you know, I wrote against it, and I am not aware in what respect I have indulged it. And I have attempted to live a stricter life. Every Lent since it first came on me I have spent up here, except such necessary returns to Oxford in the course of the week as Oxford duties made necessary—and for the last two years I have been here almost entirely. And I have made great efforts to keep others from moving in the direction of Rome also.

Of course there is no fear of your supposing me not to be conscious of innumerable weaknesses and errors in my heart and conduct—but I cannot help trusting they need not come into account here. Or, even though there has been at times sin more than ordinary, I trust it is not being laid to my charge.

Moreover I certainly think I may say, that in many respects my heart and conduct have improved in the course

of this five years, and that in respects in which I have prayed for improvement. Then the question comes upon me, why should Providence have granted my prayers in these respects, and not when I have prayed for light and guidance?

And then, as far as I see, all inducements and temptations are for remaining quiet, and against moving. The loss of friends what a great evil is this! the loss of position, of name, of esteem—such a stultification of myself—such a triumph to others. It is no proud thing to unsay what I have said, to pull down what I have attempted to build up. And again, what quite pierces me, the disturbance of mind which a change on my part would cause to so many—the casting adrift, to the loss both of religious stability and comfort—the temptation to which many would be exposed of scepticism, indifference, and even infidelity.

These last considerations are so serious, in the standard of reason as well as in the way of inducement, that, if it were not for antagonist difficulties, I don't see how I could ever overcome them. But it does strike me on the other side, 'What if you are the cause of souls dying out of the Communion of Rome, who have had a *call* to join it, which you have repressed? what, if this has happened already?' Surely time enough has been allowed me for wavering and preparation—I have fought against these feelings in myself and others long enough. And then another terrible thought strikes me. We hear of physicians thinking they have cured a complaint, when they have but thrown their patient into a contrary one—and enough has happened to make me fear greatly lest a sort of latitudinarianism and liberalism *may* be the end of them (though forbid it!) whom I am keeping from Rome. I am quite sure there is this *danger*. I dread it in particular persons. The time may even come, when I shall beg them to join the Church of Rome and they will refuse. Indeed I sometimes feel uncomfortable about myself—a sceptical, unrealizing temper is far from unnatural to me—and I may be suffered to relapse into it as a judgment.

What then is the will of Providence about me? The time for argument is passed. I have been in one settled

conviction for so long a time, which every new thought seems to strengthen. When I fall in with friends who think differently, the temptation to remain quiet becomes stronger, very strong—but I really do not think my conviction is a bit shaken. So then I end as I began—Am I in a delusion, given over to believe a lie? Am I deceiving myself and thinking myself convinced when I am not? Does any subtle feeling or temptation, which I cannot detect, govern me, and bias my judgment? But is it possible that Divine Mercy should not wish me, if so, to discover and escape it? Has He led me thus far to destroy me in the wilderness?

Really I dread what would be the consequence if any intimate friend of mine joined the Church of Rome. Might I not feel it impossible to disobey what seemed a warning to me, whatever trial and pain of mind it involved?

How this letter will distress you! I am ever thinking of you, My dear Keble.

Yours affectionately,

J. H. N.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

June 11, 1844.

I have been saying for several days past, that, if I had not grown almost inconceivably callous, this publication of Arnold's 'Remains' would almost break my heart, so very distressing does it appear to me, when I think of it with my cool understanding; and yet I go on as usual, though sometimes wondering at myself—and now your letter has come, not unexpected, yet very much like a clap of thunder, which one has been waiting for; and I did not lose my night's rest, though I keep saying to myself, What shall I and thousands more do? And where shall we go?

You will readily understand what is the bitterest part of one's feelings in the whole matter, both in respect of Arnold and of your change—not that I mean to compare the two subjects in the least degree in point of distressful-

ness—but in both one has a sad depressing thought, that, if one were or had been other than one is, the anguish might have been averted or mitigated. To think that you remember me continually is indeed a most consoling thought—may it always be so, and may I be more worthy of it.

So far as your letter may be considered as stating a case, I really hardly know what to say to it. I feel as if I had suggested on former occasions all that I could now say; but I still shrink from the thought of committing myself to Rome, as it is. Had Providence committed me, the case were quite different; and it is not for such a one as I am to determine how far the history of your own mind amounts to such a providential indication. I wish you knew enough of my old friend, John Miller, to lay the case before him, or, (which I suppose is impossible) that it could be laid before him, without his guessing the person. However, I hope you will not be deterred from writing to me by the uselessness of my replies, so long as it is the least relief to you to write on such things.

In any case surely you will be guided, and, if others are guided differently, may not both in some sense be right?

Ever yours affectionately,

J. K.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

June 12, 1844.

You will easily imagine how dissatisfied I am with every word I write to you, and will excuse one's fidgetting and continually adding 'more last words.' I want now to speak to you about *two things*:

One, the idea which seems to pervade your letter, that, if after all you should be allowed to be erroneous in this your judgment, it is equivalent to judicial blindness or something of that sort.

I do not exactly see why you should assume this, unless the error were supposed deadly or fundamental. I can

imagine there might be providential purposes in allowing even a Saint to mistake the degree of harm in communicating or separating from a particular portion of Christ's people, or the necessity or sacredness of such and such an institution : so that, even if after a time he found himself to have been in error, he need not of course assume that the error was judicial. If your present view is right, Pusey's I suppose is wrong : should one therefore infer that his prayers for light and guidance are not heard ?

Do you not think it possible (I dare say I borrowed the view from yourself) that the *whole* Church may be so lowered by sin, as to hinder one's finding on earth anything which *seems* really to answer to the Church of the Scriptures ? and will it not be well to prepare yourself for disappointment, lest you fall into something like scepticism ? You know I have always fancied that perhaps you were over sanguine in making things square, and did not quite allow enough for Bishop Butler's notion of doubt and intellectual difficulty being some men's intended element and appropriate trial.

The other thing I wanted to say to you, or rather to make you feel, was, that one of your friends at least, hopes (and he believes a great many would be of the same mind) that nothing which may happen will make any kind of separation or hinder confidence. It is so utterly different from a change in the other direction ; but of course one fears how it may be on your part ; I mean, what Duty may suggest to you.

Ever dearest Friend,

Your grateful and loving,

J. K.

P.S.—Of course you make allowance for the longing to be at rest as a secondary influence possible in your case.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Oriel College : June 13/44.

My dear Keble,—If the pain I am causing you is fault of mine, and so far as it is my fault, how much I have to



answer for, and how cruel am I! And really I must feel without any hesitation or doubt that, unless I had in ways I could name offended Him in whose Hands are the direction as well as the issue of all events, this pain might in great measure or altogether have been spared you. It might have come on you gradually, or naturally, or in some way or other have been destroyed. I distinctly think that the course of events during these last years (I am not speaking of their termination which is still in the unknown future) has been complicated by offences of mine which I could specify.

However let me, almost in self-defence, beg and pray you not to be sorry that you can be cheerful. What should either you or I do, if things oppressed us as they might? I hope it is not wrong to be cheerful, for I cannot help being so. Surely to keep in an equable frame of mind is the only way to be able to view things healthily and rightly, and to lose heart and spirits is the way to get excited, or in some way or other to lose the gift, or to hinder the bestowal of a 'right judgment in all things.' Do not lament that you do not lose your sleep. I think sleep is the greatest of our ordinary blessings. Nothing goes well with the mind without it; it heals all trouble.

As to Arnold's 'Remains,' I cannot put myself enough in your place to know the precise points which pain you so acutely—but for myself, there seems much to take comfort in things as they are. I do not think that the book will produce any great *effect* in a wrong direction. Of course there is a great deal in it to touch people—but there is so little *consistency* in his intellectual basis, that I cannot think he will affect readers permanently. And then it is very pleasant to think that his *work* has been so good a one—the reformation of public schools—this seems to have been blessed and will survive him, and forms the principal or one of the two principal subjects of the book. And further, if it is right to speculate on such serious matters, there is something quite of comfort to be gathered from his removal from this scene of action, at

the time it took place ; as if so good a man should not be suffered to commit himself *cominus* against truths, which he so little understood. I wish I was in a better humour for bringing out what I mean.

Ever yours, My dear Keble,  
Most affectionately,  
J. H. N.

P.S.—I should add that my own state is this, not as if I felt at this moment any strong distress at still remaining quiet, but that I cannot tell how soon my feelings may change, or external circumstances interpose. And it comes upon me that when persons are on the brink of serious actions and afraid to plunge into the stream, Providence in mercy takes them by surprise.

Since I began this letter, Church came into the room, and began to talk on what he and others fear to be the case in Oxford, the growth of scepticism. He gave me instances. It seems to me certainly likely to be more and more a pressing evil.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore : June 20/44.

My dear Keble,—I don't think I can be wrong in sending you the enclosed. It missed me, and I went to Roehampton the day before yesterday, after wavering about, whether to go or wait. Johnson said B. was low—which, as it turns out, arose from the abscess. I stayed there the night, and came away yesterday.

I found him very weak, but able to move about on a crutch, and to dine downstairs. He is most wonderfully calm and cheerful—you cannot understand it unless you saw him. It is difficult to believe he is so ill. As I sat by him, he could not help half laughing again and again, and could only say ' It is your face—it reminds me of old times.' His fidget, which he brings out again and again in the most simple manner, is that he can do nothing. He has been

writing a memorandum of certain particulars of the building of Roehampton Chapel, and, if he comes to Oxford, as they propose in August, he wants to be reading in our Library here for St. Boniface's Life. He and she both realize entirely his very pitiful state—but when one sees him so placid and equable, it is hard to believe that he does.

For myself, I have given up all hope since last October. People say in various ways that I am desponding—but the question, alas, is, whether I come right or not.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. N.

P.S.—Mrs. Harrington (of B.N.C.) died suddenly on Tuesday morning. The Principal had been dining out the evening before. She had been in a very anxious state of health for half a year—and he seemed to think ill of her. She was Dean Smith's daughter; she and he have been *very* attentive to me ever since they came to Oxford.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

June 23, 1844.

I thank you again and again for sending me the account of Bowden. I have never ceased to think of him, and to be in care about his illness, since I first heard of it.

I should fear the account of him was a very bad one in a temporal sense: but surely it is one in which one scarce dares grieve for the person's own sake; though what to augur publicly and ecclesiastically from such bereavements one hardly knows. I am glad to see that you think Mrs. B. prepared. I should hardly have guessed it from her letter.

You know not the good which your former note did me: though I am afraid I had made myself out a greater sufferer than I really was. But it never will do for me to be talking of myself. . . .

It is true that J. Miller, years ago, when the Berens *τόπος* was first started,<sup>1</sup> expressed an opinion that the

<sup>1</sup> The allusion must be to some forgotten controversy. There was an Archdeacon Berens in the 'thirties.

Creed of St. Athanasius would perhaps be better in the Church's Archives, instead of coming into the service. I had forgotten this, when I mentioned him to you. My reason for thinking of him, I believe, was my recollecting that, as long ago as when the article came out on the Catholicity of the English Church, I had or saw a letter from him, in which he expressed his feeling about the drift of that article in such a way as makes me now think that he had detected your state of mind in writing it. And this, I thought, might indicate a power of sympathizing with you, which might make him a good adviser, had circumstances thrown him more in your way. I speak from memory, for I cannot now refer to the letter.

I am very sorry for poor Dr. Harrington, whom I have respected ever since he was Principal for the line I heard he was taking.

You, I believe, as well as Pusey and Oakeley, have withdrawn from the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. I am getting up a Memorial against the Bishop of Chester's Lutheranism, which I think will end in my withdrawing—Moberly and Wordsworth have signed it: but I suppose it will be re-written before it goes up.

I am now in hopes of getting something done in Hursley Church, which is really a scandal, and more so every year.

I never thanked you for your kind letter when I sent you the Lectures.

About Arnold perhaps I shall write again. There is certainly much comfort in what you say.

Your ever affectionate,

J. K.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Roehampton : July 3, 1844.

My dear Keble,—You will like to hear about Bowden, though you must not expect any very cheerful account from me—so much so, that I should not like what I say repeated.

Mrs. B. has been most kindly open to me to-day—and told me all she thinks and knows. My report last time about her was from Miss Swinburne. She has now spoken to me herself in a way which quite confirms what I then told you. The medical man here says that he did not expect B. to get through last winter. And his bad symptoms have in no respect yielded from that time. Every medicine has failed. It is quite cruel to see him lie inhaling medicated air—it seems such a mockery. Sir John S. told me that from the end of January his expectoration has been continual, daily—and the medical man says, which is worst of all, that though, if things take their course, the progress of the complaint will be very slow, yet he may easily break a vessel in coughing, which would be fatal. It is, as you may fancy, more than I can describe, to see Mrs. B. sitting by him in these fits of coughing, she knowing this. His calmness is most wonderful—and hers too. His Father was buried yesterday; of course he could not attend.

I am to administer the Holy Communion to him to-morrow morning—and really I do hope I may be able to come here, to do the same, again and again, while they are here—but do not know how this will be. They leave in August, their lease being out, and talk of going to Malvern. To their great comfort no one thinks of his going abroad. As I write this in my room before going to bed, I hear him coughing—and know it went through all last night.

Oxford news was gloomy when I left—or rather Oxford anticipations—yet I cannot fall into them. Ogilvie was with the Archbishop about Ward's book. Though he is Visitor of Balliol, he cannot interfere, it seems—because he must act in *court* of Master and three senior Fellows, one vote sufficing for a negative on proceedings. Yet people are in dread of some act from authority—but the Archbishop is said to be so very unwilling to enter upon new measures, and to be so fond of delaying and evading great questions, that I cannot think he will refuse to Wardism what has before now been granted in our Church to Wesleyans, Sabellians, Socinians and Swedenborgians.

The Master has been ill of his emotion, or what the Italians, I believe call *arrabiato*. He sent for Wootten. He has sent down seven men who were to have read with their Tutor in Oxford during the Vacation—taking care to mention Coffin's Sermons as among the causes of their dismissal.

I am so sleepy I can hardly hold a pen. As to my own matters, I should be much obliged by your telling John Miller my case, or any one else, who, you think, would be of service to me, mentioning my name or anything else you please.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. N.

*July 4, Morning.*—That coughing last night was a bad discharge—but what it means we cannot tell till the doctor comes.

J. H. NEWMAN TO E. L. BADELEY, Esq.

Littlemore: Aug. 23, 1844.

My dear Badeley,—Though I foresee this will not go till Sunday, I begin writing. It would please me very much to accept your hospitality again in London, but I shall not go to Richmond for some while, as Wilberforce does not press. I should like to see you, not only for the pleasure, but because, seeing you and Hope seldom, I always have a feeling, which in part must be well founded, that I do not express my meaning and state of mind correctly to you. It always seems to me that I am talking in an unreal way—I can't master and bring out my real feelings at a moment—and Hope on the other hand, though perhaps he is not aware of it, is not entirely at his ease and familiar, and therefore not in the way either perfectly to take in my meaning or to give me his own. And then, when, conscious of this, I attempt to explain myself, I only seem to myself to make matters worse.

I do not know quite why I should say all this; for considering my own position now and henceforth, there does

not seem any reason why I should wish you to know my meaning, when I am sure I can do no good to any Church cause—but it is a natural impatience—and a not unnatural wish to be not misunderstood by men like you and Hope. And all this prose has come of your asking about Richmond ; (Sunday, Aug. 25) yet it bears on what I would say, if I could, about Pusey's matter.

As you know, I fully acquiesce in the conclusion to which even you have come now. I do not see how it could be avoided. Yet it is impossible to disguise from oneself the very serious consequences it involves. Here is a solemn University Act in condemnation of a sermon, which is an understatement of a doctrine which must be called Catholic—and now, (as the distance since it took place obliges one to say) accepted by the silence of the Church and her Bishops. The only attempt at protest has had reference to the formality of the Act. Bishops can charge against other errors, but even when they have that opportunity and call to speak, they can be silent here.

No acts at this time of the day surely can unchurch us, if we have not been unchurched by the events of the Reformation—but they may bring out, they may force on the mind, the fact we are, that we long have been unchurched. The Jerusalem Bishoprick three years ago disturbed me in a way very few people know, inflicting on my imagination what my reason had been unable to withstand some years before that. And now comes this formidable transaction whispering the same thing into my ear, or rather to my heart. Every form of heresy is tolerated, but there is an instinctive irritation, or shudder, at anything too Catholic. Six hundred clergymen can condense a legion of heresies into a manifesto, and the Bishops (one exception, if so, is not much) can be quite silent—and when a University has stigmatized a true doctrine, it is thought a great thing, if one Bishop, without committing himself, tells this or that clergyman in private that he does not mean to initiate proceedings in his own

Diocese—A clergyman of popular celebrity can in print deny a theological phrase which a General Council imposed, and not a word is said. Our leading religious Society recognises (I think) the heretical Churches in the East founded on its denial, and places £1000 into the hands of our Bishops for their benefit—and remonstrance is vain. What do such facts, (true in substance though perhaps I have not expressed myself accurately in detail,) what do they show, but that we are not 'built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets'? These are very fearful thoughts, which have long, very long, crowded upon my mind, and oppressed it, and which really do seem likely one day to come to something, I feel I should [be] almost a hypocrite, if I went on much longer without giving utterance to them. I did not mean thus broadly to have expressed them when I began my letter last Friday, but they have come out.

Excuse me, if I am taking a liberty, but I don't think you will think so.

Yours very sincerely,

J. H. N.

The following letter probably refers to the opposition which was attempted against the election of Dr. Symons to the Vice-Chancellorship.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

My dear Keble,—The enclosed will explain themselves. I have nothing to add. I determined to do just what Badeley, J. Mozley, Rogers etc. did—and I suppose the enclosed shows that they mean to take it up.

I have a good account of your brother, which is comfortable. Bowden is getting weaker and weaker. He is at Clifton. I have not seen him this three weeks. I go to him next week.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. N.



J. H. NEWMAN TO E. L. BADELEY, Esq.

Oriel : Sept. 9, 1844.

Dear Badeley,—I have been too busy to answer you before now : and indeed I do not know that strictly speaking I have anything to say, but to thank you for the kindness which your letter showed. Convictions are things which cannot be transferred—one would not wish they could be. As well could persons change hands as opinions, which are worth anything. I never then like talking to another on matters of doctrine on principle ; what right has one to do so ? He is he, and I am I. It seems an impertinence.

Yet not to do so seems like reserve and unfriendliness—so I will say something. Yet not in the way of argument, but to let you into my own feelings on the subject in question.

My own convictions about it are of very long standing. For years I have been engaged in overcoming them, under the idea that possibly they were unfounded. I have acted like persons who pinch themselves to be sure that they are not asleep and dreaming. That I had one and one only view was certain, but then was it a delusion ? Was it the accident of an excitement ? I cannot think I was wrong in repelling it, and trying to shake it off from me. Nor does it seem to be wrong after many years of patient waiting, to begin to listen to it.

It is not this or that event which causes it ; they do but remind me of it. To show that they may possibly be otherwise explained, as you kindly do, is to *my feelings* like the conduct of a patient in a consumption and of his friends, who satisfactorily show that not one of his symptoms but may be referred to some cause short of the fatal malady, not one which involves the necessity of death. Yet a bystander or physician has a view, though he cannot out-argue ; and the event justifies it. We are naturally friends, for we are children, of this dying or dead system in which we have lived all our days. We cannot, we will not, believe what the real state of the case is. We

cannot be persuaded to open our eyes. Every ominous fact admits of an explanation, and in it we take refuge. Consider the shock with which child, parent, or wife hears of the inevitable blow. It is like a dream. Nothing would convince but the actual sight of the calamity which cannot be explained away. No such positive, visible, tangible evidence is attainable in a moral matter. There is no bier and funeral of a Church. The fact then escapes unwilling minds: yet it may be as certain to others, as the prospective termination of a fatal malady is to the physician.

I do not say I have that certainty, but I am approximating to it. To judge from the course of my thoughts for five years, I am certain of reaching it some time or other. I cannot tell whether sooner or later. This is an abrupt odious letter—but it is on an odious subject.

Yours most sincerely,

J. H. N.

#### REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

September 13, 1844.

I never have thanked you as I ought for sending me those accounts of Bowden. Besides the sweet calmness and resignation which they describe, it is a peculiar comfort to such a one as I am to find himself remembered at such times and in such places. From something I accidentally heard, I had fully expected to hear of his being taken from us before now. Who knows how much help his being so long spared under such circumstances may bring to many who need to learn calmness and resignation?

I return James Mozley's letters, for which I much thank you. It was *in some degree* a mistake about my wishing for this move. I argued the point with Jeffreys that there was nothing in it *undutiful*, but I greatly questioned the *expediency* of it, and do so still, and so I told Mozley in a letter which I wrote before I heard from you. But I shall be guided by Marriott in the matter. If he still wishes it to proceed, I shall surely try and come up. I don't think

Wilson will ; but Peter Young probably will. I have not seen Moberly, though I have tried.

My brother is certainly better, thank you ; though still not quite as one could wish. We were all very much pleased to meet Dodsworth, whom we had never seen before. And there were other things also about our journey far more comfortable than one could have deserved or expected. I was very glad to meet Mr. Meyrick at Bisley.

I did not think Isaac looking very well, and I wish I may not have made him lower than he was. But it is a part of what people like me bring on themselves, that, if they speak any truth, they sadden their friends, and, if they go on as if nothing was the matter, they feel like hypocrites. But enough of this and too much.

Pray give my love to Copeland, and ask him when he is coming here ; and be sure, my dear N., that, if I seem uncomfortable, it is no more than is good for me, and, if it had not been for you, (under God) it might have been more.

Always very affectionately yours,

J. K.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore : Sept. 14, 1844.

My dear Keble,—I have been going to write to you for some days, to tell you what there was to be told about dear Bowden, and your letter has just come.

I was at Clifton on Wednesday and Thursday last, not having seen him for a month. He was sadly altered. Fever has come on and perspirations. He certainly would not get from Clifton, except that he has in a way set his heart on waiting God's time at St. Leonard's, where he was all last winter and has a house now ready for him. It so happens he has no home, though he has just come into property by his father's death, Roehampton having gone out of his hands last month. Perhaps I may stay

with him when he gets to St. Leonard's, for he seemed to wish it, I thought—but I shall hear more in a day or two.

He gave me an account how he got through the day. Sept. 15. He does not like not to come down stairs while he can, though it is a great effort to him, particularly dressing. He lies on his sofa with Bible, Prayer Book, Breviary, and 'Paradisus Animæ' on a little desk before him; but his thoughts are so unsteady now, that he has wished much, but sought in vain in Bristol, some sacred emblem or picture which may meet his eyes without effort. I took him the 'Paradisus' by accident for another purpose two months ago, and he has seized upon it with great delight, and says it is a great comfort to him. He made me read Compline, Terce and Sext with him. Besides that he manages to get through the Morning and Evening Prayer, I believe—and sometimes the Penitential Psalms in the Breviary. Morning is his best time for eating, and he takes his principal meal then. His worst time is between six and eight in the evening. He gets out, or did, but a day makes a change now, in a Bath Chair—but he cannot bear the beautiful scenery at Clifton—it tries him. At length the hours have passed away, and no more expedients are needed. Evening comes, and he seems to have some quiet sleep of a night which recruits him, and he lies very tranquilly in bed. So he is lifted upstairs by his two servants, making a sort of low interjection, not of pain but of relief, 'lo, lo, lo,' or the like, and says, as he told me, 'Well, another crest has been topped, another billow is over,' calling the days his billows, with an allusion to 'Who would count the billows past?' He made me come and see what he called his 'procession'—his wife first with the candle, then he in the arms of the two men. While going up, he turned about his head, to be sure I was looking.

One forgets past feelings, else I would say that I had never had pain before like the present. I thought so yesterday, and said so; but I suppose it is not so. Yet I am in very great distress, and do trust I shall be kept from gloom and ill temper. I have given him up since October

last, yet have not realized his loss till now, if now. He is my oldest friend. I have been most intimate with him for above twenty-seven years. He was sent to call on me the day after I came into residence—he introduced me to College and University—he is the link between me and Oxford. I have ever known Oxford in him. In losing him I seem to lose Oxford. We used to live in each other's rooms as Undergraduates, and men used to mistake our names and call us by each other's. When he married, he used to make a similar mistake himself, and call me Elizabeth and her Newman. And now for several years past, though loving him with all my heart, I have shrunk from him, feeling that I had opinions that I dared not tell him, and that I must be constrained or almost hypocritical if I was with him.

Lewis has come up to tell me the news that dear Bowden is gone—I suppose this morning. I am going off at once to Clifton. I have heard no particulars. But it distresses me to have parted so suddenly with him on Thursday when he wished me to stay and did not know I was going.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. N.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. AMBROSE ST. JOHN

17 Grosvenor Place, London : Sept. 16, 1844.

. . . C. M. (Charles Marriott) told me something from Lewis, which cleared up everything : viz. that dear J. W. B. died in London. Everything was plain then ; the physician had recommended his instant removal, and he had died on the way.

So it proved to be, but nothing could be happier or more peaceful than all the circumstances. He sunk rapidly ever since I saw him. On the Wednesday he talked to me of going to St. Leonard's for a fortnight—on Thursday he talked of my coming to Clifton as on this day, that he might go off sooner [to London]. By Friday night he had limited his hopes to getting to his Father's house in London.

Dr. Bernard thought that his desire ought to be granted, that he was sure of getting to London, that the change might even for a day or two retard the complaint—but that no time was to be lost, and that he could not last many days. This he said on Saturday morning at eleven, and said ‘ why not by the next train ? ’ he offered to come up with them. They were off by twelve ; got to the station by a quarter past one—The train was just gone. He had to wait two or three hours in his carriage till the next. What a trial for her ! but he was most calm and happy, and showed not the slightest disappointment or trouble. He was peaceful all through the journey, and they put him to bed directly he got here. At four o’clock next morning (yesterday) he had a little coughing, could not get rid of the matter, gave over the struggle and was gone almost at once. She saw it directly. Nothing was to be done. I am full of wrong and miserable feelings, which it is useless to detail—so grudging and sullen when I should be so thankful. Of course when one sees so blessed an end, and that at the termination of so blameless a life, of one who really fed on our ordinances and got strength from them—and see the same continued in a whole family, the little children finding quite a solace of their pain in the Daily Prayer, it is impossible not to feel more at ease in our Church, as at least a sort of Zoar, a place of refuge and temporary rest because of the steepness of the way. Only may we be kept from unlawful security, lest we have Moab and Ammon for our progeny, the enemies of Israel.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

17 Grosvenor Place : Sept. 17, 1844.

My dear Keble,—As you saw, I was writing my note, and the unexpected news came. I did not know where it had taken place, and I left home, at Mrs. B’s wish, not knowing where I was going.

It seems that he died, I must not say on his road to St. Leonard’s, but at home at his Father’s house here, where his

Father had died not three months before. Indeed, he had given up the idea of getting to his winter quarters when he started. On Wednesday last he talked of moving in a fortnight—on Thursday morning in a week. On Friday when his brother came he talked of no more than getting to London. Dr. Bernard had a talk with Henry B. on Saturday morning, and said he might last a week or fortnight, that moving could not hurt and might be of service to him, and that there was no reason for resisting his strong wish. But, he said, no time is to be lost—why not go to-day? why not by the next train? This was at eleven. They were off by twelve. Got to the station—were just too late for the train. Had to wait for two to three hours; what a trial for her! However, he was most calm and happy, and showed not any disappointment, which was very unlike his usual way—for on journeys he had always been over-punctual and eager. He sat in his carriage the whole time—and when she came to him for some reason, put his head out to her and said ‘Wish not, dear friends, my pain away.’ He was happy all through the journey—and made allusion to some things which had amused him some days previously. When he got here, he was put to bed at once, Dr. B. then thinking he would last a week. At four o’clock on Sunday morning, he had a little coughing, could not expectorate. She saw at once what was coming and it was over at once. (It is a great comfort to all parties that he is here and not at Clifton.)

He died, and he lies, in a room I have known these twenty-four years—the principal drawing-room. So many persons have I seen there, so kind to me—they are all gone. The furniture is all the same—the ornaments on the mantelpiece—and there lies now my oldest friend, so dear to me—and I with so little of faith or hope, as dead as a stone, and detesting myself.

I shall remain here over the funeral, but I suppose no longer.

They have a picture here I had not seen for a number of years by Hoppner—of J. W. B. a boy of four years and

his younger sister. He was asked how he should like to be painted—and he said ‘drawing a Church’—so Fulham Church is in the background, and he with a pencil and paper.

Ever yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—Mrs. B. is quite an heroic person—her whole bearing is quite out of the way. It forces itself upon one at a time when one has not much heart to be thinking of such things.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

September 19, 1844.

You are very kind to send me so many particulars—so many which, I hope and believe, will soon begin and always continue to be a great comfort to you. Just now you are stunned with the blow, but, as to being hard-hearted, I have too sad and shameful experience how soft-hearted people who cry easily may soon let go the good thoughts which come to them from such death beds, and have their hearts hardened in another sort of manner. But really and truly may not one accept such a calm departure as this as a pledge of mercy and comfort in one’s own cares and perplexities? The gleam has gone behind the cloud, but we know it is still there, and are permitted and encouraged to hope for a sight of it again at no very long distance.

This is a sort of sacred time to us, or at least ought to be so; for my youngest sister was taken away from us the 20th of September 1826. And on the same day, I conjecture, this year, your dear Bowden will be buried. I hope Mrs. Bowden will not droop too much when that is over. It is a great thing having her children to think of, and also his most remarkable calmness will no doubt help her in memory almost as much as when he was in sight.

Altogether, it seems very much to realize George Herbert’s notion, of going from earth to paradise as from one room to another. . . .



J. H. NEWMAN TO E. L. BADELEY, Esq.

Littlemore : Nov. 1, 1844.

My Dear Badeley,—Thank you very much for your answer about Formby, to which you gave me a great deal more time and consideration than I had any right, intention, or hope to gain from you. I hope he will be the better for it.

Perhaps I ought to tell you all about the £100. My most dear friend Bowden wished me to lay it out in some memorial of him. So I have thought of books. I want them both handsome and useful—and I thought, since the binding cannot be the same, of putting his arms upon them, as a College does upon its prize books, unless this seemed very unreasonable. Doing so would also overcome a difficulty I have hitherto felt in getting books on *two* subjects—but anyhow I should *prefer* one subject. I have Muratori, Gavanti, &c., in the Liturgical line, though only part of Catalini—and I have also a smaller sum of money, to spend in a like way, which I think I shall give to books of that kind—so that on the whole I shall put the Liturgical line aside.

I thought of the Bollandists—but Southey's copy was £130. And common copies would not be handsome. I certainly do want handsome books, and this turned my thought to classics—especially as classics are cheaper than old English historians, and I want them more.

I have Tanner, Dugdale, Browne Willis (in part), Hearne (in part), Twysden, 'Scriptores post Bedam,' Alford, Cressy, Du Chesne's 'Script. Norm.,' the 'Gesta Dei per Francos,' Le Cointe, &c., I have not Gale, or Du Chesne's 'Script. Franc.' But I doubt whether I could make up *a set*, and that is what I want—not to fill up gaps.

I am very scanty in classics. There is a handsome set (not complete) of 'Variorum' in Kerslake's last catalogue, in Russia, 119 vols., or thereabouts, for £36. This is cheap, but of the authors contained in it I have about forty volumes—and eighty volumes for £36 is perhaps not cheap. Valpy's classics are said not to be handsome, except the large paper. Willis had lately a set complete (small paper) for I think

£32 in calf. What I think I should prefer would be a handsome set of all the Latin in Octo., and then certain Greek classics, such as those I mentioned to you which are with comments as Plutarch, Strabo &c., in folio and quarto. What is your opinion of this plan? What is your opinion of going to men like Kerslake? Payne and Foss are so extravagantly dear. How is Pickering?

And now don't let me be unreasonable in my demands upon your time. You see there is no hurry. I should value your advice very much, and any information you could get without trouble.

Perhaps you have heard that on St. Simon and St. Jude's Day the Master stopped Ward<sup>1</sup> (without disturbance) from reading the epistle—and read it with such wonderful emphasis that every soul in the Chapel saw its meaning 'crept in unawares' 'despise dominion and *speak Evil*' (eeee-vil) 'of dignities,' &c.

Then followed the Gospel which some persons thought told the other way, viz. about loving each other. He is said to intend to go on this principle (though his display as above does not seem like it) to forget or not to know Ward's existence as Fellow, and on this principle it is *supposed* he will act as regards Holy Communion—but I do think the whole University will feel so strongly against him that Ward need do nothing. I do not think going to the Visitor will do—that is rather the game of the other party—and I suppose they would be glad of Ward's doing so. Ward has the most intense feeling about the Visitor's unfairness on other occasions.

All this is to be considered secret—and so is this (though I daresay you have heard it all by this time, for Ward is in London) that the Master has pitched upon a provision in the statutes which allows him in difficult cases to go to the Visitor *proprio motu*—and the Visitor or his deputy can punish with any degree of severity short of expulsion.

<sup>1</sup> For a full account of the scene see *W. G. Ward and the Oxford Movement*, p. 325. The heavy drops preceding the storm over Ward's 'Ideal' were beginning to fall.

I fear the Fellows of Balliol will not stand by Ward—but this must not be mentioned—not on doctrinal grounds, but because his ill odour abroad hurts the College.

*Pater mi! Pater mi! currus Israel et auriga ejus.*—Rumours and reports that Newman was to be lost to the Anglican communion were springing up everywhere. In consequence, letters came from different kinds of persons, some well, some not well expressed, but each in its way a cry of anguish. Some specimens of these letters will help to reanimate the past.

#### A FRIEND TO J. H. NEWMAN

Nov. 4, 1844.

My dear Newman,—I have received information this morning, upon which I fear I must rely, which has pained and perplexed me to a degree that I could hardly express to you. The information was that you have intimated to your friends your intention of *joining the Church of Rome*.

Now as to offering you any arguments, I am fully persuaded that I am not the person to do that. But if on the strength of old associations, and the unvarying kindness which you have shown me for so many years, I may make any suggestion to you, I do so most earnestly, and (allow me to say) most affectionately implore you to *pause* before you take this most fearful step. Not yourself alone, but many, many others will be involved in it.

I have long prayed for you ; and, Providence permitting, I shall continue to do so. And whether you remain in our communion or not, you will always be remembered by me with unfeigned regard, and with a lively sense of the kindness which I have received from you.

Do not trouble yourself to reply to this. Enough, I feel persuaded, must be upon your mind, and your hands ; and it will be more than sufficient to me, if this has any effect towards making you suspend your intention.

Should I have written without cause, you know how

sincerely and amply I would apologise to you: but you also know that had I conceived there would be room for an apology, I had not written to you.

J. H. NEWMAN TO E. L. BADELEY, Esq.

Littlemore: Nov. 5/44.

My dear Badeley,—I sent your letter to Formby but not your name. It is hardly worth while sending you his answer, yet you may like to see it. I do not doubt you have done a service. Please burn it after you have read it. I see in Willis's catalogue just out Wyttenbach's 'Plutarch' in Russia for £3. This seems to me cheap. Also there is Dean Rennell's 'Montfaucon's Antiquité' which I saw when I was in town—I mention these, first as coming into the question, is it well, if I determined on classics, to pick up books anywhere or buy them of one person? and next by way of saying that the 'Plutarch' *does seem* a bargain, and asking your opinion. But really I am almost frightened lest I should be rudely encroaching upon the time of a busy man like you.

Yours very sincerely,  
JOHN H. NEWMAN.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore: Nov. 6/44.

My dear Keble,—I write you just a line in consequence of reports about me which are afloat, and which may make you anxious. They are altogether unfounded. The letter of Isaac [Williams] is a mere myth—I have not been writing to him a line.

You should make Copeland give a volume to the 'Plain Sermons.' He has been preaching very nice Sermons for a long while. They want curtailing however.

I went at last to take advice for my drowsiness and unsteadiness of handwriting—At first my medical friend,

Mr. Babington, spoke very seriously—but when he saw me he relented. He says I ought to take tonics—but the difficulty is to give them me without throwing too much blood into my head. I am at St. Athanasius, which is very trying—but the *translations* will come to an end in a few weeks.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. N.

A STRANGER (apparently) TO J. H. NEWMAN

Nov. 7, 1844.

Reverend Sir,—I sincerely trust that I may be pardoned the liberty of addressing you, but my extreme anxiety must plead for me. Your published Parochial Sermons have been, under God, the means of rousing me from spiritual sleep, and I have from them, and from their operation upon my mind, been led to regard your opinions with a reverence greater than I can express. From your Lectures on Romanism also I have been taught the errors which that system, if I may so express myself, contains. May I then venture to ask the truth or otherwise of the report, now in the newspapers, of your having quitted the communion of the Church of England—I can only repeat that my intense anxiety must plead in palliation of this apparently unwarrantable request, but I feel assured that your good and kind heart will pardon me and relieve me from the distress of suspense.

AN OLD SCHOOLFELLOW TO J. H. NEWMAN

Nov. 11, 1844.

My dear Newman,—I turn from solemn scenes in which I have been engaged—the deathbed of a near relation, and the dangerous illness of a schoolfellow of us both—to put into execution what, I assure you, has been on my mind even in the midst of so much sorrow and anxiety. It is to send you a line of entreaty on the step that you are

reported to have announced your intention of taking. O my very dear friend, to whom I am so deeply and eternally obliged, not so much for private acts of friendship, but for the reality and consistency which your writings with others have imparted to my religious views—can you think of leaving us, so many as we are that have benefited by your exertions? I entreat you not to forsake us—we shall be left a scorn and derision to those that are round about us—already pointed at enough for endeavouring to restore Church principles in our own little sphere, we shall be made powerless altogether if a master of our Israel forsakes our communion. . . . There are so many that love you and revere your character, and have been formed by your works, who will be utterly cast down, if you take this step, who will not know where to turn, that I conjure you not to do it, unless conscience makes it altogether unavoidable. My dear friend Clarke, an Ealing boy, is perhaps dying, and, if he is taken away, it will be an unspeakable loss to me, but that separation would be as nothing to my hearing that Newman, who rescued me from low views and such as now seem scarcely believing views, had ceased to call himself my brother, and declared me to be in heresy. Oh! Newman, do do stop with us—what shall we do without you!

On November 10 a great friend of Newman's, the Rev. Edward Coleridge of Eton, sent him a letter from Selwyn, the Bishop of New Zealand, and an extract from a letter of the Bishop of Newfoundland. They were to be shown to Pusey and Pusey only. He asked Newman to present Selwyn and two other 'Antipodal Bishops' with copies of 'Sermons on Subjects of the Day.' The letter concluded with earnest wishes that Newman might be 'kept with us and for us in the Anglican Branch of the Catholic Church.'

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. E. COLERIDGE

Littlemore: Nov. 12th, 1844.

I shall send your most precious enclosures to Pusey tomorrow by a safe hand with your directions about their

return to you. How to thank you for the kindness and confidence which you have shown in sending them to me, I do not know. The Bishop certainly is a rare person—and his being where he is, is a singular mercy to that country and makes one muse about its future fortunes in the purposes of Providence.

I had intended in answering you to have said a word on the subject, personal to me, with which you close your letter—indeed I began writing with this intention—but now when it comes to the point, it seems so miserable a return for your kindness, that I cannot get myself to do it. Nor do I know how to send the Volumes you speak of, I have no business to be sending volumes on such an errand.

The pain I feel at the distress I am causing others, at the great unsettlement of mind I am causing, and the ties I am rending, is keener than I can say. On Saturday for some time my heart literally ached, and is still uneasy. And I have the griefs, not of one, but of so many upon me.

And all this in addition to the original and principal trial itself, which has been a secret anxiety upon me for years. Everyone must see at a glance how many and strong natural feelings and motives I have against committing myself to such acts, as nevertheless seem likely to be urged on me as imperative to my salvation—but none can know the dismal thing it is to me to trouble and unsettle and wound so many quiet, kind, and happy minds. What is it I say to myself, short of duty, which propels me to the thought of such [an] act? I cannot find anything.

Pray accept my best thanks for your kind sympathy.

J. H. NEWMAN TO E. L. BADELEY, Esq.

Littlemore: Nov. 13th, 1844.

I actually have taken your hint and written to Leslie to enquire what he would give me for my Bollandists if I take his. It has grown upon me that such a set, while it is a whole, is more suitable as a memorial of B. than

the Classics. And he had always a great liking for Southey. And then you report that it is a handsome copy which was my difficulty about medieval books in general.

You may have heard the last Oxford news—that a Committee of Heads is appointed to consider what ought to be done, or if anything, about Ward's book.

J. H. NEWMAN TO E. L. BADELEY, Esq.

Littlemore : Nov. 16/44.

I told Pusey the other day that I did not think his succeeding in his suit would be worth the weight of a feather in retarding certain persons from Rome—and this, in answer to his saying that he wished to be ruled entirely by my feeling in the matter, and had no wish to move on his own account. Yet I think he will still cherish hopes that if he does succeed, he will be detaining men. I do heartily wish he were not so sanguine, unless indeed (which may be the case) such sanguineness carries him over *all* difficulties.

I am unwilling to speak more strongly than I have, but I seem to be ruining his position, when he might right himself and be in the University and Church all he has been.

A Committee certainly is vigorously at work on Ward. I hear the names of our Provost, Cramer and Gaisford (who is most fierce), but Harrington and Richards are not on it. They evidently mean to do something very strong—and are said to rely on Convocation, the prestige in our favor being broken in the last meeting. There is a report that St. Stephen is to be brought before them too. If they advance beyond J. H. N. i.e. the two first numbers, I suppose Toovey will have an action in law against them for libel. And all the publishers in London will be for him.

Your report of the hundred and odd seceders is good. It is the first I have heard of it. I wonder *where* such portents are created—are they real births of the brain, or equivocal generations, or do they form in the air ?



If it is not troubling you, I should be glad of your buying for me any Classics in the following list—according to your discretion. As to the ‘Acta,’ I am sorry to hear where it is gone, but I ought not to be sorry I lost it, for my delay was not shilly shallying.

P.S.—I find Hope has been heard of at Milan.

Edward Coleridge’s reply to Newman’s letter of the 12th was a long and earnest appeal to him not to leave the Church of England unless absolutely compelled by his conscience to do so. He entreated him to think of the effect his secession would have upon those who had relied upon him, and assured him that there were many persons, far more numerous than Newman’s modesty would allow him to believe, who rested so implicitly upon his guidance that, go whither he would, they would follow him, actually ‘against their conscience.’

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. E. COLERIDGE

Littlemore : Nov. 16th, 1844.

My Dear Coleridge,—What possible reason of mere ‘preference’ can I have for the Roman Church above our own? I hardly ever, even abroad, was at any of their services. I was scarcely ever for an hour in the same room with a Roman Catholic in my life. I have had no correspondence with anyone. I know absolutely nothing of them except that external aspect that is so uninviting. In the ‘Tablet’ and ‘Dublin Review,’ in radical combinations and liberal meetings, this is how I know them. My habits, tastes, feelings are as different as can well be conceived from theirs, as they show outwardly.

No—as far as I know myself the one single over-powering feeling is that our Church is in schism—and that there is no salvation in it *for one who is convinced of this*. It is now more than five years since a consideration of the Monophysite and Donatist controversies wrought in me a clear conviction that we were now, what those heretics were then. Two persons alone, whom I was with at the time,

knew what had happened to me—and I instantly addressed myself to overcome the feeling. I think I was quite right in attempting it—I should have been wrong not to have done so. And I succeeded—for two years I was satisfied it was my duty to remain quiet, whatever change in actual opinion had taken place in me. I dwelt upon the Roman corruptions, as we consider them, and balanced them against our difficulties. But this time three years the conviction came on me again, and now for that long time it has been clear and unbroken under all change of circumstance, place, and spirits. Through this time my own question has been ‘Is it a delusion?’ and I have waited, not because my conviction was not clear, but because I doubted whether it was a duty to trust it. I am still waiting on that consideration.

That our Lord is present in our Eucharist, if we have the Apostolical succession, and the right form of consecration, is acknowledged even by Roman Catholics—and that the Gift is, not sealed up, but actually imparted, though our Church be in schism, to those who are in involuntary ignorance, this again is even acknowledged by them. And that in fact it is bountifully imparted I have proof on every side of me—but still, it is imparted to those who are in involuntary ignorance, not to those who are according to this mysterious Providence enlightened to discern what the real state of the Church is. If I once am absolutely convinced that our Church is in schism, there is, according to the doctrine (I believe) of every age, no safety for me in it.

This, my dear Coleridge, though not intended argumentatively, but merely drawn out by your letter to show you my view of the matter, will, I know well, pain you much—but anyhow you must be pained; and I can but trust that each minute of sorrow, as it passes, is so much gone and over, and is getting rid of what must be, and will be thus exhausted.

As to the persons you speak of, I do earnestly trust, *and think*, that, when it comes to the point, they will be

wiser and more sober, than to take a headlong step merely because another has moved before them. That I shall perplex and unsettle them, I know full well—that some may eventually be persuaded to take the same course is not improbable—but I do not fear that religious persons will be thrown off their balance—I trust them too well—I have a greater confidence in the love for them of Him who has made them what they are, to fear that He will abandon them.

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

November 18, 1844.

I ought to have thanked you sooner for your kindness in writing to me about that report. I had made up my mind that there was nothing in it, thinking it very unlikely that Isaac Williams should put a confidence in the Editor of the 'Morning Chronicle' or his informant which he denies to my brother and to me: and feeling on other grounds sure that it could not be true.

I wish I could hope that all my dear friends were in some way approximating more to each other on those awful subjects; or rather I should say, I wish I could see this: for *hope* it I most assuredly do and shall do, as long as one sees on both sides such unquestionable endeavour to please God and practise a submissive mind in all things. I do not, and cannot expect to see my way in the controversy, as a controversy: but I seem more and more clearly to feel that the want of approximation in those whom we are bound to believe really good persons on both sides is a providential indication that such as I am at least should stay to be true penitents where they are.

Pusey asks me for my impression as to the line which he should take about preaching, when his suspension expires. My *impression* is, that he should proceed nearly as if nothing had happened, recapitulating the substance of his last

Sermon, as he must do for clearness' sake in going on with his course. In so doing he will re-state the obnoxious points, and give occasion, though without any challenge, to the Heads to repeat their censure. If they do not, his point will be so far gained that the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Real Presence may be preached at St. Mary's, and the doctrinal scandal caused by his suspension will be removed. If they censure him, the matter will be fairly mooted without any questionable forwardness on his part, and, having had warning, he will give them no such advantage as he did last time. Do tell me, if you think that this course will be objectionable in respect of those who doubt the Catholicity of the English Church.

I hope I shall not annoy you, if I copy out for you part of a letter which I had the other day from Judge Coleridge.

'I am struck with part of a letter from . . . of . . . expressing a wish that Newman should know how warmly he was loved, honoured, and sympathized with by large numbers of Churchmen, so that he might not feel solitary, or, as it were, cast out. What think you of a private address, carefully guarded against the appearance of making him the head of a party, but only assuring him of gratitude, veneration, and love, as one whose teaching had been eminently useful,' etc. etc. and he adds: 'It is my hasty thought of the moment.'

I don't suppose this will come to anything: it seems to me a thing rather to be discouraged on some accounts, but I thought I would just let you understand how such a person as Coleridge feels, and I don't think he mistakes you. It seemed to me, from what he said when I was staying with him the other day, that he quite entered into your feelings, though he would not agree with you in all opinions; of course, he would not think himself capable of judging. Therefore, my dear Newman, do not in any case imagine, that you have not hundreds, not to say thousands, sympathizing with you and feeling indeed that they owe their very selves to you.

I can only speak for *one*, of certain knowledge. Your

sermons put me in the way, and your healing ministrations helped me beyond measure. This is *certain knowledge* of mine; and here is Wilson sitting opposite with just the same feelings; and Young next door, and Moberly at Winchester, and Ryder a few miles off, and Ellison whom I saw the other day; and in short, wherever I go, there is some one to whom you have been a channel of untold blessing. You must not be angry, for I feel as if I could not help saying it, and I am sure the very air of England around you would say the same, if it could be made vocal. They have had unspeakable help from you, and it is now their turn to help you with their prayers and good wishes, now that you seem to be called for a while to be patient in comparative silence and inactivity.

We shall be anxious to hear about your health. How I wish it might agree with your plans to come here, if it were but for a day or two, and let us try if we could not mend your handwriting, in which art, *as you see*, we greatly excel.

. . . Medley has been here to consult whether he shall accept the Bishoprick of New Brunswick. . . .

This is a sad rigmarole—but you will forgive it, from yours ever very affectionately,

J. K.

I suppose that in the 'Christian Remembrancer' about Arnold is James Mozley's. How beautiful the part about R. H. F. in some respects.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore: Nov. 21, 1844.

My dear Keble,—I feel Judge Coleridge's great kindness and consideration, but do not find myself able to come into his proposal, or rather the proposal he throws out. It is difficult perhaps to give my reasons. I am afraid of a *vémeosis*. What I feel most at present as to the attacks made on me, or rather the only thing which I *feel*, is the charge of dishonesty. Really no one but O'Connell is called so distinctly and so ordinarily a liar,

as I am. I think nothing tends to hurt my spirits but this. I am not treated merely as a gentleman, and that by educated people. Now as far as any such expression as Sir J. C.'s went to protest against this, I should value it much—but then it strikes me I should be removing a cross from me, and I might have a heavier one put on me. If there is a cross which is blessed from those who have borne it from our Lord's own time, it is this—and it is safest to be content with it.

His letter went far beyond this, however—and such words as 'veneration, love' etc. I really could not bear. I am not used to them. I never have heard them. I hope there is nothing wrong and ungrateful in shrinking from them. I am not sure there is not something of pride. But I really could not bear them. And though I say this, yet, inconsistent as it is, while I should be pained at them, I really do think I could be elated too—and, please, do keep me from *this*.

And then I do think they would increase, not diminish, my greatest grief of all—which is the unsettlement of people's minds. For the more I realized that people sympathized in me, the more acutely I should feel the pain I was giving them. Is this selfish?

I am making too much of this, you will say—yet I will add one thing—I should fear that some persons at least, who took part in such an expression of kindness, would think that my present tendencies arose from the want of such expressions, and would hope to stop them by means of it. Now I have had extremely kind letters from Manning, Gladstone, Blowell<sup>1</sup> and others, but they have not operated ever so little in shaking the deep confidence I have at present that Christianity and the Roman Catholic system are convertible terms, or in reviving more hopeful or comfortable feelings about our present state.

I hope you will not think I am writing a cold reasoning answer to your so very kind letter. I wrote one first of all thanking you etc.—and then it struck me that all

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps 'Browell.'

this was unnecessary between us, so I have burnt it, and begun again.

While I am on the subject of myself, I will say one or two things more.

When I was first taught the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration by Hawkins on my getting into Oriel, of 'the Church' by Whately in 1825, and of Apostolic Succession by Hurrell seven years later in 1829 (after James on 'Episcopacy' in 1823), I began to profess them and commit myself by definite acts to the profession, with far less of intellectual conviction and feeling of certainty than I now have of Papal Supremacy and Catholic communion. I doubt whether I should ever have held those doctrines, if I had gone on in the shilly shally way in which I am going on (rightly or wrongly) about the last mentioned.

I doubt whether I *can* have clearer conviction than I have without a miracle, if then. And Bishop Butler warns us against expecting too clear evidence in moral questions.

For three full years I have been in a state of unbroken certainty. Against this certainty I have acted, under the notion that it might be a dream, and that I might break it as a dream by acting—but I cannot.

In that time I have had no ups and downs—no strong temptations to move, and relapses again—though of course at particular moments the (if so be) truth has often flashed upon me with unusual force.

I scarcely ever was present at a Roman service even abroad. I knew no Roman Catholics. I have no sympathies towards them as an existing body. (I should observe, however, that I have certainly been touched by hearing some were praying for me.) I am setting my face absolutely towards the wilderness.

I am not conscious to myself of being *set upon* moving. What I try to preserve is what divines call the state of 'indifferentia.' Touched and grateful as one must be for the prayers of one's own friends, I have tried to make out whether there is any feeling of impatience on my mind, as

if they were keeping me back—any *fear* of their prayers—any unwillingness to contemplate (*Domine, si vis*) my remaining where I am. I cannot detect any.

The only feeling I am at all suspicious of, is one which for an instant I have felt once or twice, but which has not remained to my consciousness on my mind, a feeling of intellectual contempt for the paralogisms of our ecclesiastical and theological theory. That I do think it full of paralogisms is quite certain—that I could, if I chose, indulge myself in extreme contempt of it, I know;—and that nothing passes in my mind of this *consciously*, I know also—and I trust I have no *latent* feeling of this kind, i.e. anything to bias, to influence me. What I have asked myself is, ‘Are you not perhaps *ashamed* to hold a system which is so inconsistent, so untenable?’ I cannot deny I should be ashamed of having to profess it—yet I think the feeling, whatever be its strength, is not at all able to do so great a thing as to make me tear myself from my friends, from their good opinion, from my reputation for consistency, from my habitual associations, from all that is naturally dear to me.

You must not suppose, I am fancying that I know *why* or on *what*, on what *motive*, I am acting. I cannot. I do not feel love, or faith. I feel myself very unreal. I can only say negatively, what I think does *not* influence me. But I cannot analyse my mind, and, I suppose, should do no good if I tried.

Now I earnestly trust, and think, I may be able to preserve my present position till I have something to determine me, in spite of what I have said: but still one or two things must be said.

Think of my age. Have I not, if any one, a right to judge and decide?

Then, it is near four years or much past them, since I have published either Tract or Review or other writing on ecclesiastical questions.

My last two *professions* of opinion, I think, were in 1838, in my letter to Faussett—and (the constrained one) to the Bishop in the beginning of 1841.



For more than five years I have been employed in retreating from my position.

I have been silent for a year past.

My sole ascertainable reason for moving is a feeling of indefinite *risk* to my soul in staying. This, I seem to ascertain in the following manner. I don't think I *could* die in our Communion. Then the question comes upon one, is not death the test? shall one bear to live, where die one cannot?

I am kept first from deference to my friends—next by the fear of some dreadful delusion being over me.

A sorrowful and unthankful reply this to yours—which, I will but add, cheered me as far, as with such dreadful questions before me, I can be cheered.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. N.

P.S.—Don't suppose I am asking for an answer—I don't think it can really add to your pain, but rather relieve it, to know just where I stand.

The following letter will be read with interest for its own sake, and because of the allusions to a conversation which the writer had held with Newman a few days before. It also illustrates the strange mixture of familiarity and reverence with which Newman was treated by his friends.

#### A LAYMAN TO J. H. NEWMAN

21 November, 1844.

My dear Newman,—The idea has been haunting me that in the course of our conversation on Saturday I may have said something improper, or which may have given you pain. If so I am very sorry for it, pray forgive me, and be assured that nothing could be further from my intention.

The subject indeed was one of such intense interest, and overwhelming importance to my mind, that I may very possibly have been betrayed into saying things to you which

I should otherwise have shrunk from saying—indeed I now feel conscious to myself of having been somewhat too bold and presumptuous. And yet, inconsistent as it may appear, somehow or other I can scarcely bring myself to be sorry for what I said (except so far as it may have given you pain) for God is sometimes pleased to make use of the meanest and most contemptible instruments for the accomplishment of His inscrutable purposes.

O that it might be so in this instance! that any words of mine might have weight enough to assist in setting at rest the painful and agitating doubts with which your mind is harassed on this most absorbing question!

Yet how can I presume to entertain any such hope? As if you had not most maturely and deeply weighed the matter over and over again in all its bearings.

And yet it may be, as I ventured to hint to you before, that your peculiar position may render you less apt than some others to see the full extent of the consequences to be apprehended from such a step as you contemplate. I confess that to my mind they are so fearfully alarming both as regards the peace and welfare of individuals and of the Church at large that I cannot think of them without dismay.<sup>1</sup>

Here at home in our own communion, what confusion to our friends, what triumph to our enemies! and to Rome what an argument to confirm her in her errors and abuses! What hope, humanly speaking, can remain to our poor humbled Church, after such a blow? And now that she is beginning to show signs of life and raise her drooping head, to find herself all at once despaired of and deserted by her best champion; one who, under Providence, has been the chief instrument in raising her from her degraded state, and, as it were, breathing into her afresh the breath of life! Surely the bare thought of this is enough to make the whole head sick, the whole heart faint. But I cannot, I will not believe that such a fearful calamity is in store

<sup>1</sup> [Everyone took it for granted that Newman did not realise how much people depended upon him.]

for us. I take heart from your own words, from expressions in your own writings, which seem absolutely to forbid it, especially in your letter to the Bishop of Oxford (I think it is), where you say that till Rome moves towards us, it is *quite impossible* that we should move towards Rome.

From this and many other passages of the same tendency coupled with your assurance that nothing had occurred within the last three or four years materially to affect your sentiments on the question at issue<sup>1</sup>—from all this I cannot but gather much hope and comfort. I am encouraged too by the apprehension you expressed that your present doubts might arise from some delusion; and that in such a state of things, and upon a matter of such unspeakable importance you might indulge a hope that God in His mercy would vouchsafe to you some more immediate and certain intimation of His will. And indeed, if I may presume to judge, this does seem to be a case, if ever there was one, in which such extraordinary direction might be humbly hoped for.

I earnestly pray that God may be graciously pleased to grant you such light as may be needful to guide your steps in this dark and doubtful way; that He may give you strength to wait in quietness and confidence to see what He will do for His Church—‘O tarry thou the Lord’s leisure, be strong and He shall comfort thine heart.’

I can say no more, indeed I fear I may have said too much already; if so pray forgive me, and Believe me, as much as ever,

Your grateful and devoted friend,

N.

P.S.—I am tempted to cry out (indeed the words have been haunting me ever since I saw you last, and I must say them)

Tu Patronus es, tu Parens,  
Si deseris tu, periimus.

<sup>1</sup> Newman had the greatest difficulty in making his friends understand that it was not *external* events which were influencing him.

On November 28 Faber, who had placed himself under Newman's guidance, wrote as follows :

' I want you to revoke your prohibition, laid on me last October year, of invoking our Blessed Lady, the Saints and angels. Really I do not know whether I ask this in a lower or less spiritual mood than usual, or whether the mere pain I feel in not speaking to the Blessed Mother of God drives me to it. . . . Oret has become almost intolerable.' He goes on to say that he will do what Newman bids him—' obedience will do me more good than invocation.' He then speaks of his state of mind ; he had recoiled from the idea of change more than before, yet he could give no good grounds for staying where he was.<sup>1</sup>

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. F. W. FABER

Littlemore : Advent Sunday [Dec. 1], 1844.

My dear Faber,—I find it very difficult to answer you, both on your own account, and from diffidence which you will easily understand, in my own judgement. Perhaps it will be best for me to put some of my reasons before you, as far as I can.

I can understand certainly that Oret may be intolerably cold. It does not strike me that you infringed your rule by using the Confiteor ;—but now as to direct and habitual invocations.

Really I have a great repugnance at mixing religions or worships together, it is like sowing the field with mingled seed. A system is a whole ; one cannot tell the effect of one part disjoined from the rest. All this you know better than I can state it. Observances which may be very right in Saints, or in a Church which creates saints, in a communion in which the aids of grace are such and such, may be dangerous in a communion which has them not. I do not like decanting Rome into England ; the bottles may break. Indeed I look with much anxiety to what is doing now in many quarters—not the least to the inculcation of extra-

<sup>1</sup> The letter is printed in full in Bowden's *Life and Letters of F. W. Faber*.

ordinary degrees of asceticism ; extreme strictness about indifferent matters, heights of devotion and meditation, self-forgetfulness and self-abandonment, and the like. What is natural in Saints and in a saintly system, becomes a mere form in others. Of course the Invocations you write about would be no form in you, but others evils might come of them.

Again, I am not sure there is not danger of presumption in taking what belongs to another system at will. Private judgement comes in, and eclecticism. There is an absence of submission to religion as a rule. And I am not satisfied that our Church has not a claim in such observances on the obedience of her members to her directions. And when a man is holding office in the Church, so to speak, as you are, I think there is a still greater difficulty in the adoption of such observances.

You will understand without a word of mine, that I am saying all this by way of showing you the grounds of my opinion, and not as forcing it upon you. I am far too much perplexed myself in various ways, to feel it pleasant to give advice at all—much more to suffer what I say to be taken as a decision on the point. I hope you will but use what I have said as suggestions for your guidance.

I cannot think that Oakeley's arguments in the E. Ch. will stand, more than you, and I shall be surprised if the Bishop of L. likes to be told that O. considers that the Pope has a prior claim on his obedience.

Ward has been had up—and Romanizing propositions submitted to him to deny. He has got till Tuesday to answer.

I hear people speak with great commendation of Sir Launcelot and hope soon to have time to read it. I hope you have recovered the fatigue of St. Wilfred.

Yours most sincerely,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

‘ I look with much anxiety to what is doing now in many quarters—not the least to the *inculcation of extraordinary*

*degrees of asceticism,* &c. These words recall one of the most penetrating of Newman's sermons, 'Dangers to the Penitent,' the fourth in 'Sermons on Subjects of the Day,' preached on October 30, 1842. That this sermon should have been called for is an amazing testimony to the depth and intensity of the religious spirit aroused by the Oxford Movement. A few passages from it, pieced together, may serve to recall it to the memory of those who have read it, and to stimulate the curiosity of those who have not.<sup>1</sup>

No state is more dreary than that of the repentant sinner. A man finds that he has a great work to do, and does not know how to do it, and his impatience and restlessness are as great as his conscious ignorance.

*First Danger.*—Repentant sinners are often impatient to put themselves upon some new line of action. Their heart yearns towards humiliation, and burns with a godly indignation against themselves, as if nothing were too bad for them; they look about for some state of life to engage in, some task or servile office to engage in. But it commonly happens that God does not disclose His will to them at once, and for that will they ought to wait. 'O tarry thou the Lord's leisure.'

*Second Danger.*—Be on your guard against excess. Persons do not know what they can bear, and what they cannot, till they have tried it. It is a great fault to be ambitious, and men may easily aim at praying more than they can, or at having a clearer faith and deeper humility than at present they can have. All things are done by degrees. Let them also remember that a slight penance, if long, is far more trying than a severe one, if short, for it outlasts their present agitated state of mind.

*Third Danger.*—Rash vows or promises are to be avoided. If men desire to be of little account in the world, let them not at once make any engagement or profession to that effect. Instead, let them daily pray that they may never be rich, that their dwelling be ever lowly, their home solitary; that others may have precedence over them, others speak while they are silent, others receive deference, and they neglect, others have handsome houses, pleasant gardens, etc. Will not such a prayer be a sort of recurrent

<sup>1</sup> The words of the preacher have been kept to, as far as possible, in what follows, but it has not been thought necessary to use inverted commas or marks of omission.

vow, yet without that dangerous boldness which a private, self-devised resolution implies? Who can go on day by day thus praying, yet not imbibe somewhat of the spirit for which he prays? Yet, let no one rashly pray thus, lest, before he wish it, he gain his prayer.

*Fourth Danger.*—Men should be careful not to act without advice. What an inconsistent age is this! Every department of things that are, is pronounced to be capable of science, to rest upon principles, to require teaching, except self-discipline. This is left to take its chance.

The sermon concludes with an appeal, made doubly effective by the counsels of prudence which preceded it. 'Let us excite each other to seek that good part which shall not be taken away from us. Let us labour to be really in earnest, and to view things in the way in which God views them. Then it will be but a little thing to give up the world; only an easy thing to reconcile the mind to what it at first shrinks from. . . . All will in time become natural to us, which at present we do but own to be good and true. We shall covet what at present we do but admire.'

The reader will have observed that the dangers of which the preacher speaks could only beset men who were eager for a *hidden* life of self-denial. There is not a word which suggests those outward manifestations of intemperate zeal which might have their source in hidden springs of self-love, as, for example, a hankering after notoriety, a secret wish to be thought well of, or even the desire to be identified with a great cause. What must have been the anguish of the man who had stirred up in others the yearning after holiness, which every line of this sermon implies, when he felt bound to dissipate the work of his hands! He had no illusions as to the comparative fewness of those who would follow him; and feared much for the stability of those who did not.<sup>1</sup>

The reader's attention may also be called to another sermon, the ninth in the same volume, which is equally an historical monument. Its title is 'Indulgence in Religious Privileges,' and it is a warning to those who were attracted by the beauty of the Catholic ideal, as set forth by the Movement, but turned away from its severer side.

<sup>1</sup> In *Loss and Gain* at the end of chap. v. he makes Reding say: 'I fear so very much that all you who do not come forward will go back. You cannot stand where you are,' &c.

The preacher almost speaks as if the Church of England was being transformed! 'A more primitive, Catholic, devout, ardent spirit is abroad . . . the piercing, and thrilling, and kindling, and enrapturing glories of the Kingdom of Christ are felt in their degree by many. Men are beginning to understand that influence, which in the beginning made the philosopher leave his school, and the soldier beat his spear into a pruning-hook. They are beginning to understand that the Gospel is not a mere scheme or doctrine, but a reality and a life,'<sup>1</sup> &c.

The end of the sermon is well worth attention. The preacher had evidently been brought face to face with the question, if our lives are to be shaped after the pattern of the Apostles and the first Christians, must all God's temporal blessings, 'all the beauty of nature . . . the advantages of civilised life, and the presence of friends and intimates,' be given up? The reader must find out for himself how this question was answered. The best way of inducing him to read the sermon, is to stimulate without satisfying his curiosity.

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore : December 16 /44.

My dear Keble,—You will like to know, if you do not, the state of dear Robert Williams. He is on the point of a severe operation, and is under a good deal of anxiety of mind—very much so—I am going to London to him to be with him during it. I shall stay but a short time. A tedious and disagreeable illness awaits him after it, I hear.

For myself I am just recovering from a severe influenza, which wonderfully pulled me down—and I cannot properly stand and walk, as it is. The principal symptom was extreme prostration of strength.

How singular, as it appears to me, is the progress of things in Oxford, considering it is quite external to myself, and while concurring does but concur with my state of mind. I have had nothing to do with Ward's book. I objected at the time to many things in his articles and said

<sup>1</sup> *Sermons on Subjects of the Day*, p. 115.



I did not see the good of them. I took no part of any kind in the publication of the Ideal itself, nor was asked to do so. And, since it came out, I have told him and others, that much as there was valuable in it, I would not entertain the main theory on which it is written that a man may hold all that the Church of Rome holds yet remain under subscription to our formularies, or (which is the same thing stated without reference to the particular case) that a Church could have the Sacraments without the doctrines of the gospel, or could impart grace yet not possess authority. And next I was against the move of October against the Vice Chancellor as its authors knew—though I took no active part against it, and followed where others followed. From these two facts, the provocation given by Ward's book and the hopes excited by the overwhelming majority for the Vice Chancellor, has arisen the proposition for a test which now lies before Convocation. It may indeed be rejected,—but at present it certainly does seem as if external events were taking matters into their own hands.

Ever yours affectionately,

J. H. N.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

December 27, 1844.

St. John's Day.

. . . I want very much to thank you for your two kind letters, and for thinking so much of me in all your perplexities. . . . Certainly it is a sad unsettled world: the two lessons out of Isaiah for Christmas Eve struck me as a melancholy contrast between what this part of Christendom is and what it might be; but *is it better elsewhere?*

As to the Heads I think it very likely that they were put up to this, as you say, by Ward's Book, and by their great majority for the V.C. but then I also think that the same things have emboldened them to ride their horse too hard, to propose a penalty which Law will set aside, and a test which will not be carried.

In respect of Ward, I am quite resolved to vote against the censure, and almost to give some reasons which will entirely avoid the theological question; as the doubtfulness whether they have a right to degrade him, the unfairness of treating him so rigidly in respect of the Articles, while they let other people do as they like by the Prayer Book, the folly and irrelevance of most of their quotations, and of their reasoning upon them, the positive excellence of his book in general, and *very particularly*, the falsehood and uncharitableness of charging him with dishonesty, and that in a formal and abiding document.

I suppose there is something in these reasons, as I hear people continually starting one or other of them. The Test seems to excite great disgust, I cannot help fearing that they will withdraw it and carry the other measure, which seems to me a most undesirable issue.

I trust you continue better. The cold pinches my wife sadly. Wilson is tolerable.

Am I right in thinking that Ward's view of the English Church is the same as yours in the 'Subjects for the Day,' only that you speak doubtfully, he more or less positively?

Forgive this very stupid letter.

Ever yours very affectionate

J. K.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

December 29, 1844.

My dear Keble,—R. W. is going on well but with a great deal of pain and discomfort. How surprising that his long course of health and spirits should be thus reversed! They expect he will not get out of doors till the end of February—his confinement began in the middle of November. A sad Christmas he has had—distressed by the state of Church matters as well as by his personal sufferings. It must be intended for some good end.

W. Froude has been here to-day for a few hours, and confirms your account of the dissatisfaction which the

Test creates. It will be a remarkable fact if it is rejected—for that will be an indirect assertion of No. 90. On this Ward relies as an illustration of the expedience of his line of acting. He says that Convocation would to a certainty have condemned No. 90 four years ago, had it been summoned—i.e. to talk is to persuade. Say things, and people will get accustomed to them and admit them. I have always thought this, but I cannot go with Ward in his particular application of the principle—because I do not think it *ought* to be admitted, even though it *be* admitted.

I mean, I think it shocks common sense to say that the Articles are compatible with a maintenance of the *whole* circle of Roman doctrine. Again, it is a great paradox to say that a Church has the gifts of grace yet no authority in teaching; is priest, yet not prophet. And further, I think he would go beyond my 'Sermons on the Day,' thus;—that he would *deny* that we *are* at all part of the Catholic Church. He has not said so, and I should not wish it repeated, but since you wish to know, I suspect he holds that we are simply external to the Church. Now, it is one thing to say (as I have said) that our Church has lost its external notes of Catholicity, another to say that she has no Catholicity at all. I do not say he is always consistent in implying the view I am imputing to him—and for this reason, if for no other, it would be wrong to charge him with it. Yet if he holds it, I cannot but think it very dangerous. To remain knowingly out of the Church seems next door to maintaining some bad heresy. I mean, I should not wonder at a person so acting falling any day into any error. It is quite another thing to be in doubt.

I have said all this, because you seem to contemplate writing in his defence, and therefore you should know, as you wish, what he holds. I do not know how to say I wish you to write, for it is bringing you into trouble; yet certainly your writing would be very serviceable to him. I doubt however whether a pamphlet would not be of more use three weeks hence than now—and indeed probably you will not get out yours till the end of that

time. I mean that, it may be a mere finesse, I cannot tell, but it seems to me as if our friends must *begin*, not by defending Ward, but by securing an opposition to the test. When this point is well worked, persons who have pledged to oppose the Test may be led on to what they would have shrunk from at first, the defence of Ward. W. F. reports that Pusey's Letter has done good—and I doubt whether it would, had he not confined himself to what was personal to himself. By waiting too, you will see what Ward is going to say—for he is at a pamphlet.

All good Christmas wishes to you and Mrs. Keble. I hope she is better for the change of weather—though W. F. says, contrary to my hopes, that we shall have some more cold.

Ever yours affectionately,  
JOHN H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—No one can have a more unfavourable view than I of the present state of the Roman Catholics—so much so, that any who join them would be like the Cistercians of Fountains, living under trees till their house was built. If I must account for it, I should say that the want of unity has injured both them and us.

Dec. 30.—They suppose in Oxford to-day strongly that the Test will be rejected and Ward condemned.

## CHAPTER IX

### THE END

'Ad vesperum demorabitur fletus : et ad matutinum lætitia.'

THE chief topics upon which the letters in this last chapter touch, are (1) the 'Essay on Development' ; (2) Mr. Ward's condemnation ; (3) the action brought against Mr. Oakeley by the Bishop of London.

(1) Some interesting particulars concerning the writing of the 'Essay on Development' will be found in the letters. They complete the account given of it in the 'Apologia.' In this last-named work Newman speaks of his object as an immediately personal one. 'At the end of 1844,' he says, 'I came to the resolution of writing an essay on Doctrinal Development ; and then, if at the end of it, I found my convictions in favour of the Roman church were not weaker, of taking the necessary steps for admission into her fold.'<sup>1</sup> The results on his own mind were not, as he seems to have anticipated, merely negative. 'As I advanced,' he goes on to say, 'my difficulties so cleared away that I ceased to speak of the "Roman Catholics," and boldly called them Catholics. Before I got to the end I resolved to be received, and the book remains in the state in which it was then, unfinished.'<sup>2</sup>

In his correspondence he speaks of another and perhaps more urgent motive, viz. the duty he felt that he owed to others of explaining the reasons for the great change which had come over his opinions. There were two ways in which this duty might be performed. The one was by putting forth something which would immediately excite interest.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Apologia*, p. 228.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.* p. 234.

<sup>3</sup> If, for example, he had written something in the manner of his *Lectures on Anglican Difficulties*. It is a mistake to regard these lectures as a brilliant piece of impromptu work. Like the *Essay on Development*, they are full of the thoughts which had been seething in Newman's mind since the autumn of 1839.

The other was by writing a severe philosophical treatise, which, instead of creating a sensation, would take time before it made its way. In his letters he gives his reasons for adopting the latter course.

The writing of a book like the 'Development' in the space of nine months was an extraordinary achievement, and our wonder is increased when we learn from the author's correspondence how many of these months slipped by before he could be said to have got fairly under weigh. When he began to write, the exact form his work was to take had not as yet shaped itself in his mind. One thing in particular must strike all readers, who bear in mind the limited amount of time which from the first he intended to devote to the book, and that is the immense labour expended upon details. When a building is run up in a hurry, care may be taken to make it weather-proof and suitable for the purpose it is intended to serve, but upon details not strictly necessary time and labour will not be lavished. In the 'Essay on Development' there are no such marks of parsimony of time and labour. To take an example almost at random. In the third section<sup>1</sup> of the fifth chapter of the original edition the author is discussing the use and the abuse of hypothesis and antecedent probabilities in historical inquiries. For purposes of illustration he first turns to Giesler's text-book of ecclesiastical history, and gives a number of instances where this author colours, distorts, and interprets facts by tacit assumptions of his own. He then dissects Gibbon's account of the Paulicians, and shows how the historian, with the air of one engaged in marshalling indisputable facts, constructs it on a somewhat slender likelihood. Next he turns to Thirlwall and Heeren, giving instances where they had to eke out scanty records with antecedent probabilities. He ends with a specimen of a covert assumption made by Mosheim. Congenial as this kind of work was to Newman, it must have taken up a good deal of time, and was not urgently necessary for the object which he had in view.<sup>2</sup>

(2) On February 13, 1845, the Hebdomadal Board at Oxford proposed three measures to Convocation. The

<sup>1</sup> Omitted in later editions.

<sup>2</sup> Compare chap. ix. s. 3 of the *Grammar of Assent*, where he handles in the same fashion some half-dozen works on Greek and Roman history.

first was a condemnation of Mr. Ward's 'Ideal'; this was passed by 777 votes to 386. The second was to deprive Mr. Ward of his University degrees; this was carried by 569 to 511 votes. The third was a censure on Tract 90. This was not put to the vote: 'the Proctors, and the senior Proctor, Mr. Guillemard of Trinity, stopped it in the words, *Nobis Procuratoribus non placet.*'<sup>1</sup>

(3) Frederick Oakeley, who, besides being in charge of the Margaret Street Chapel, retained his Fellowship at Balliol, felt his position would be an unsatisfactory one if he did not give the University authorities an opportunity of taking proceedings against him, for his own views concerning the Thirty-nine Articles were the same as those of Mr. Ward. In consequence, he published a letter to the Vice-Chancellor defining his position. The challenge was not taken up; but later on he published a pamphlet which gave the Bishop of London an opportunity for attacking him. The Bishop required him to resign the Margaret Street Chapel, and on his refusal instituted a suit against him in the Court of Arches. Oakeley had a powerful backing, for the congregation at Margaret Street was wealthy, influential, and enthusiastic. Among his most strenuous supporters were Hope, Bellasis, and Badeley. His prospects, according to the estimate of his advisers, were as follows. He might escape in the Court of Arches on technical grounds, but if the prosecution raised the doctrinal question, he was almost certain to be condemned. If this happened, they would advise him to appeal to the Privy Council, which would be very likely to upset the judgment of the Court of Arches. When Oakeley refused to resign the Margaret Street Chapel, his mind was not unsettled, but before the trial came off, it became clear to himself and others that, whether it went for or against him, he would sooner or later leave the Church of England. When Newman learned this, he was very urgent that Oakeley

<sup>1</sup> Church's *Oxford Movement*, p. 382. The second Proctor was Church himself. Nearly a quarter of a century later, Newman recalled the service he had then rendered him in the following words: 'I cannot forget, how, in February 1841, you suffered me day after day to open to you my anxieties, and plans, as events successively elicited them; and much less can I lose memory of your great act of friendship, as well as of justice and courage, in the February of 1845, your Proctor's year, when you, with another now departed, shielded me from the "*civium ardor prava jubentium*," by the interposition of a prerogative belonging to your academical position.'—*Dedicatory Letter to new edition of the Oxford University Sermons.*

should place his resignation in the Bishop's hands. He wrote to this effect to two of Oakeley's advisers—Hope and Bellasis. The letter to the former will be found below. It has not seemed worth while to print the letter to Bellasis, which, by the way, was written at Oakeley's request, for it adds little or nothing to the letter to Hope.

Eventually Oakeley placed his resignation in the hands of the Bishop, but proceedings were not stayed. Judgment went by default, and the court gave sentence of *perpetual suspension* unless the defendant should retract his errors to the satisfaction of the Bishop. In later years he contemplated with some amusement the more lenient treatment meted out by the same court to one of the writers in 'Essays and Reviews' who had tampered with some of the fundamental doctrines of Christianity. This gentleman was sentenced to suspension for a year, and no recantation was demanded. 'His Lordship thought it would be wrong to suspend the defendant until he retracted, as that judgment might cause a retractation which did not come from the heart.'<sup>1</sup>

Among Cardinal Newman's papers is a packet of letters from Oakeley relating to his lawsuit. Unfortunately Newman's part in the correspondence has not been found. One point of some interest comes out casually in Oakeley's letters. Like Newman, he did not anticipate that the break-up of 1845 would be followed by a great number of persons leaving the Church of England, but he did fear that many would discard or water down the principles of the Movement, and sink back to the low dogmatic level from which it had raised them. In 1865 he seems to have thought that his fears had been in a great measure realised.<sup>2</sup>

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Jan. 5/45.

My dear K.,—I have been much hurt at seeing an article in the 'Quarterly' against Ward, said to be Gladstone's.

<sup>1</sup> See *Times* of December 11, 1862, quoted in Oakeley's *Tractarian Movement*, p. 97.

<sup>2</sup> P. 113 in *Historical Notes on the Tractarian Movement*, Longmans, Green, & Co., 1865. The 'Notes' should not be confused with the *Popular Lectures* which were published in 1855. It is a great pity that both works are out of print.



Really the author seems to write to compass his degradation. I don't deny the force of his arguments, but think it (not only unfair as an *ex parte* account of the book), but cruel just now, when he has every one upon him, and when heretics, so that they be Protestant are unmolested by Bishop or Vice-Chancellor. No one can be expected to do any thing till W.'s pamphlet appears—but it certainly strengthens my inclination that you should make a protest, if there be no other objection to it.

Ever yours affectionately,  
J. H. N.

All good wishes to you and yours for the New Year. I was much concerned to hear how ill Mrs. K. had been.

When Gladstone heard that Newman disapproved of his article he wrote him a long letter in explanation.<sup>1</sup>

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore : January 10/45.

My dear K.,—I have little to say to your paper, except that I think it very good indeed, as far as you have drawn it out. I say 'as far'—because you do not seem to have finished the third head. I should really hope that the various points you have mentioned will suggest profitable matter for Members of Convocation. They say Gladstone means to vote against the degradation—if so, I wish he had delayed his article three months.

Perhaps it would not be a good rhetorical argument, but it strikes me forcibly how unjust it is to degrade Ward on the grounds specified, for this reason—*hardly one or two persons agree with him*—hardly one or two think all Roman doctrine compatible with the letter of the 39 Articles. If so, it is a mere wanton, meaningless, pointless attack almost on an individual. When Pusey was struck, at least he represented a party—but whom does Ward represent? is Con-

<sup>1</sup> It can be read in *Letters on Church and Religion* &c. vol. i. p. 312 ff.

vocation an *ordinary* judge, to come forward *whenever* an private member of Convocation does wrong, or an extraordinary for great occasions? A great thing indeed will be done, if Ward is degraded! hardly any one else touched—no party is repressed—no principle is affirmed. The only excuse, if they condescended to think about excuses, which the Hebdomadal Board can make for not touching Sabellianisers is, that *they are so few* (I am not granting the *fact*). Milman again might escape because he is not dangerous. So painful a matter as a formal punishment is not to be inflicted except of necessity, for great evils—what is the great end in degrading Ward, etc., etc.

I go on Tuesday to R. Williams, and on Thursday to H. Wilberforce in my way to Mrs. Bowden at St. Leonard. Lent falls so early, that my holiday will be very much curtailed.

Ever yours affectionately,  
J. H. N.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

February 10, 1845.

My very dear Newman,—It seems uncomfortable not to be speaking a word to you at such a time as this, when many are thinking of you all day long with anxiety and even tenderness, whose words and thoughts, if they *could* be conveyed to you, would be a comfort to you indeed—and surely they will be conveyed to you in effect; sooner or later, in one shape or another, the dew of Hermon will fall on the hill of Sion (I trust it is not wrong so to apply the words).

If you are more hardly used by some persons, and liberties taken with your name, such as you feel, I fear, but too keenly, yet do not doubt nor forget how dearly beyond common examples that name is cherished by very many others—to whom you have been made the instrument of good, partly perhaps with this very providential purpose that so sore a trial might be tempered to you. I just want

to say this much, for, though dangerous to dwell on in a common way, it seems to me just the sort of help which one's infirmity might need and thankfully receive when the sense of being calumniated comes over bitterly upon us. You will forgive it, should it be altogether out of place; as, coming from me, it may very well be.

This move of the Heads has caused me to review the argument of my letter to Coleridge, and I think I see clearly that the case I there contemplated will not really have occurred, let the voting on Thursday be what it may. For that argument went entirely on the hypothesis that the University is the *imponens* of Academical Subscription, the contrary of which seems now to be ruled. I suppose it, therefore, to be the special duty of each person whom they censure to show by retaining his place among them that he considers their censure null and void. I have written a short letter to this effect, and sent it to R. Palmer, to be sent to the next 'English Churchman,' if P. thinks proper, because the 'E.C.' has been quoting that opinion of mine.

God be with you in storm and in sunshine, and make me fitter to be

Your very affectionate Friend,

J. K.

My wife is *pretty* well now. Wilson seems to me much more comfortable. How clever Ward's last pamphlet seems—but his rough, rude way makes him lose in rhetoric quite as much as he gains in logic.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

February 20, 1845.

I have nothing to say to you, dearest Newman, that is at all to the purpose, and yet I want to say a word to you just to say that I remember your birthday, and long to be able to keep it as I ought; but it is to be hoped there are others who will make up for one's deficiencies in that way.

One thing I should like to do would be to choose out

some one of the old days, when we most enjoyed ourselves together, either with dear H. F., or in thought and talk of him, and live over it again for an hour or two—if such indulgences are not unfit for this season: and to me they ought not to be altogether unfit, for surely they would bring with them bitter recollections of thoughts and fancies very unfit to have been where I was allowed to be. But I am not going to talk of myself.

I was going to say that, if I might choose a pleasant day to think of, perhaps the day of [laying] the first stone at Littlemore might be it. Many places and times, it seems to me, may well have taken a sort of colouring from that day, and surely it brings with it sweet and hopeful thoughts, and many of them, and the past and the future, and the living and the departed, and times of faith and times of decay, seem blended, as one thinks of it, in a way which must (by His blessing, may we not forfeit it!) issue in comfort at last.

I remember too another day, when we walked up with old Christie [J. F. C.], and there was talk of how each word of our Lord's is, as it were, a sort of Church Canon, and Christie said the talk ought to be printed, this was long after the other, but I cannot exactly remember when.

Will you bear with me in sending you this talk, which surely is worth very little?—but it will not be quite worthless, if it does but amuse you a little on your birthday.

I should like to try my memory a little further, but the post-horn is announced, and *this* letter will not keep, whatever another might do.

So believe me always in all times,

Your very affectionate and wishing-to-be-worthier  
friend,

J. KEBLE.

I will not have you trouble yourself to answer effusion like this.

## J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. KEBLE

Littlemore : February 28, 1845.

My dear Keble,—I must write to you a line on this day to thank you for your two letters—though I shall not do it as they claim or I should wish. How much has opinions, in nine years, yet how short a time it seems since we had dear R. H. F. with us.

How came you to know my birthday? and all you said was very kind and more than I deserve.

This last affair did not annoy me at all. I took no sort of interest in it. I could not, with such real subjects of pain already on my mind. I rather looked on it with hope, as leading perhaps to something.

Oakeley has been somewhat cast down by opinions, among others I suppose of yourself, against his Letter to the Bishop. I suppose no one but himself is a judge quite under his feelings and views, for they are so much his own. He is coming here, I believe, for a day or two's rest. He knows us all so well.

Ever yours, My dear Keble,  
Most affectionately,  
J. H. NEWMAN.

P.S.—Mrs. Bowden has got over the measles—but Johnny Bowden is still an invalid.

## J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. J. F. CHRISTIE

Littlemore : April 8/45.

My dear Christie,—When I reflect upon it, I ought not to be so much surprised at the report contained in your kind note just received, as I was on reading it. Generally I am careless about reports, but I cannot let this pass without at once contradicting it.

It is totally, utterly, false—I thank God so dreadful a calamity as you speak of is quite foreign to me. My mind is quite pure from it. I suppose indeed there are

few persons of education to whom sceptical thoughts do not occur, that is from without, e.g. words of sceptical import present themselves *to their eyes bodily* in a printed book. But beyond that, I have no confession whatever to make. I never have felt the temptation for an instant from within.

Very likely I have said to some persons, indeed I know I have, that I thought the English system was so inconsistent, that a careful thinker would find himself obliged to believe more than it contains or less, and that if on perceiving this he did not go forward, he might, as a judgment, be left to fall behind. And perhaps I may have said that of course it was a matter of great anxiety to me lest such a judgment might come upon me unless I made right use of what light was given me. This is the only way in which so dreadful an anticipation has ever occurred to my mind. But to fear a temptation is not to feel it.

I do not mind any one seeing this note who is anxious on the subject, but of course it should not be shown unnecessarily.

I do not forget I owe you a letter.

Ever yours affectionately,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

I said 'no' about the Hospinian—but I shall be very glad to have it.

The following letter, which has already been published in Mr. Lathbury's 'Letters on Church and Religion of W. E. Gladstone,' and Viscount Morley's 'Life of Gladstone,' can hardly be spared from a collection of Newman Letters. Preoccupied as Newman was with his own difficulties and his 'Essay on Development,' he was able to take a keen interest in what was going on in the outside world, and recognised in anything but a state of hopeless and helpless despair that the 'old order' was not only passing, but had passed.<sup>1</sup> For the circumstances to which

<sup>1</sup> He gave a vivid account, nearly thirty years later, of the 'old order' ('when I was young' and 'the State had a conscience') for Mr. Gladstone's benefit, in his letter to the Duke of Norfolk (*Anglican Difficulties*, vol. ii. pp. 264 ff.).

the letter refers, the reader must be referred to the pages of Mr. Gladstone's biographers. Stated very summarily, they amount to this. When Sir Robert Peel proposed to increase the grant made to Maynooth, Mr. Gladstone, who was a member of the Cabinet, resigned. After he had thus regained his liberty he voted for the measure. He was not able to support it *as a Cabinet Minister*, because it was against the principles with which he was identified by his book on 'The State in its Relations with the Church.' Although he saw that these principles were for practical purposes obsolete, he could determine nothing till he was inwardly and outwardly in a position of perfect independence.

J. H. NEWMAN TO MR. GLADSTONE

April 18, 1845.

My dear Mr. Gladstone,—I should not venture to encroach upon your time with this note of mine, but for your letters to me last autumn, which make me read with great interest, of course, everything which is in the papers about you, and encourage me to think that you will not think me intrusive.

As various persons ask me what I understand is your present position, I will put down what I conceive it to be ; and I will beg you to correct my account of it just as much or just as little as you please, and to determine, as you think best, whether I shall say I have your authority for any statements you may kindly make in your answer or not.

Useless words always look cold and formal on paper. I should not think of saying (what I really hope it will not even come into your passing thoughts to doubt) how great interest I feel in the line of thought which is at present engaging your mind, and how sure I am you will be conducted to right conclusions. Nor is there anything to startle or distress me in what you are reported to have said in the House.

I say then : ' Mr. Gladstone has said the State *ought* to have a conscience—but it has not a conscience. Can *he* give it a conscience ? Is he to impose his own conscience

on the State? He would be very glad to do so, if it thereby would become the State's conscience. But that is absurd. He must deal with facts. It has a thousand consciences, as being in its legislative and executive capacities, the aggregate of a hundred minds—that is, it has no conscience.

'You will say, "Well, the obvious thing would be, if the State has not a conscience, that he should cease to be answerable for it." So he has—he has retired from the Ministry. While he thought he could believe it had a conscience—till he was forced to give up, what it was his duty to cherish as long as ever he could, the notion that the British Empire was a subject and servant of the Kingdom of Christ—he served the State. Now that he finds this to be a mere dream, much as it ought to be otherwise, much as it once was otherwise, he has said, "I cannot serve such a mistress."

'But really,' I continue, 'do you in your heart mean to say that he *should* absolutely and for ever give up the State and the country? I hope not—I do not think he has so committed himself. That the conclusion he has come to is a very grave one, and not consistent with his going on blindly in the din and hurry of business, without having principles to guide him, I admit; and this I conceive is his reason for at once retiring from the Ministry, that he may contemplate the state of things calmly and from without. But I really cannot pronounce, nor can you, nor can he perhaps at once, what is a Christian's duty under these new circumstances—whether to remain in retirement from public affairs or not. Retirement, however, could not be done by halves. If he is absolutely to give up all management of public affairs, he must retire not only from the Ministry, but from Parliament.

'I see another reason for his retiring from the Ministry. The public thought they had in his book a pledge that the Government would not take such a step with respect to Maynooth as is now before the country. Had he continued in the Ministry, he would, to a certain extent, have been misleading the country.



' You say, " He made some show of seeing his way in future, for he gave advice. He said it would be well for all parties to yield something. To see his way and to give advice is as if he had found some principle to go on." I did not so understand him. I thought he distinctly stated that he had not yet found a principle, but he gave that advice which facts, or what he called circumstances, made necessary, and which, if followed out, will, it is to be hoped, lead to some basis of principle which we do not see at present.'

This letter has run to a greater length than I had expected, but I thought I would do my best to bring out the impression which your speech has given me of your meaning.

I am, My dear Mr. Gladstone,

Very truly yours,

JOHN H. NEWMAN.

Mr. Gladstone replied in a letter nearly half as long again as Newman's. ' I do not know,' he said, ' that I should have the least difficulty in subscribing to your letter as it stands ; and I could much rather say ditto to you than do your work over again in my own language.'<sup>1</sup>

#### J. H. NEWMAN TO MRS. WILLIAM FROUDE

April 20, 1845.

My dear Mrs. Froude—I have long been thinking of writing to you, both as wishing it, and thinking you might be anxious.

It is a melancholy thing to report progress—melancholy, that is, to the hearers. Were it not for the pain I am giving, I seem to myself to be likely to have no pain. I do not know, but so it seems to me, as if I had no doubt or difficulty. My mind certainly is in a very different state from what it was this time [*word illegible, possibly it is year*]. It is so made up. . . . Do you recollect the instance of L[ock-

<sup>1</sup> *Letters on Church and Religion*, vol. i. p. 73.

hart], one of our inmates here, who suddenly joined the Church of Rome, not in the best way? It annoyed us all. He joined at once the Order of Charity, and has lately, after an absence of a year and a half, been to see his mother. She has sent a friend of mine a letter, of which I have got his leave to transcribe the following extract, which I think you may like to see. Of course it is very private.

'The only mischief he may do is showing the advantage of being at rest, and nothing can be more so than he is—all his old natural cheerfulness is restored, and he is as merry as a boy, not at all like the melancholy notion gained from novels and tales of a gloomy monk; and more interested in us and our doings than he has been for years, and loving us better than he ever did. I wish your mother could see him, and many more who are dreading, with so much misery and little faith, all I dreaded this time two years ago. He has never been so much to me in his life before.' With love to W. etc.,

J. H. N.

J. H. NEWMAN TO MRS. WILLIAM FROUDE

June 1, 1845.

My dear Mrs. Froude—Your very kind letter was most welcome. . . . Did I tell you I was preparing a book of some sort to advertise people how things stood with me? I think I am bound to do this, if I can—but you may so suppose, how difficult a thing it is to do. And I have been for some time overworked—when I had finished the translation and notes of 'St. Athanasius,' at the end of last year, I said I would give myself six months' rest, for really I required it. And then I found all of a sudden this new work come before me, and I could not deny its claim on me. I have been thinking about some work or other since last March year, and turning the subject in my mind at odd times. Yet in spite of that, I have lost, if that is

the word when it could not be helped, or rather consumed several months this spring upon it in ways which will not turn to any direct account. I have had to remodel my plan, and what it will be at last I cannot yet foretell. All I know is that body and mind are getting wearied together, and the book not yet written through for the first time.

This then is my occupation at present, with many interruptions which hardly serve as reliefs. It will be a sort of obscure philosophical work, if I manage to do it, with little to interest, and much to disappoint. But I hate making a splash and, of course, I hate unsettling people ; if I could do so I would rather write something which would sink into their minds. . . . Thank you for what you say about my own comparative composure at present. Certainly I am not, except at times, in the state of distress I was last autumn. My mind is a great deal more made up. . . .

J. H. NEWMAN TO J. R. HOPE, Esq.

May 14/45.

My dear Hope,—I hope I have not been imprudent in not waiting for your letter, or that I have not committed you more than I ought. Last night I was led to have a talk with Oakeley—I could hardly help it.

I said that I thought he ought to face the question whether he had not a moral conviction that he *should* join the Church of Rome—that, from what I had heard him say, I doubted whether there was the prospect of such an event when he let the suit begin, but that his state of mind seemed different now, and that it affected, as I thought, the question of the suit.

He said that it was so certain that the suit would be decided in his favour on technicalities, that he did not think that it was a practical question.

In reply I did not venture to urge, what you said, that you thought it would have a very bad effect on the Anglo-

Catholic cause (I can't think of a better word) and be a disadvantage to it in public opinion, and with the Bishops, if he resigned or went over on acquittal, for I did not feel at home with it, and it was new to me, and I thought it would be new to him, and I did not think I could do justice to it, or could persuade him by it. That it would be an absurdity I quite see.

So I said that it did not seem to me certain that his case *would* go on technicalities—that his lawyers sending down for passages from authors etc. looked as if they anticipated something more ; further that if the arguments did run into doctrine I thought his was a bad case to try it upon ; that his view was an extreme one.

'Therefore,' I said, 'since the continuance of the suit involves a *risk*, in which many persons are involved, the question is, what is there that calls for that risk. If its favourable issue will have the effect of keeping you in the Church of England, this is a reason for it, but if it will produce no great effect one way or the other, whether you succeed or not, the risk is for nothing. You have then to make up your mind how you feel towards the Church of Rome,' etc.

As far as I recollect this is what I said—and I put it down that you may correct anything I said wrong. I don't think I committed you except generally.

P.S.—You are quite right in saying I do not take Ward and Oakeley's grounds that all Roman doctrine may be held in our Church and that *as Roman*. I have always and everywhere resisted it.

J. H. NEWMAN TO MRS. WILLIAM FROUDE

June 10, 1845.

My dear Mrs. Froude,—If I write in a different tone at one time and another, it is not that I write in different frames of mind, but that it is difficult to bring out all one would say at once. The case with me, I think, is of this kind—I

am very much more made up both in steady conviction and preparation of my feelings, to change my place—but am suffering from fatigue of mind, partly from former distress, partly from other causes. (It is very uncomfortable to go on in this way about myself, but I suppose I must.) Last year was a very trying time to me. I lost my most intimate friend, whom you did not know, Mr. Bowden. Then in the autumn was all the anxiety of breaking this matter to people, and altogether it brought me so low that I have had a succession of attacks of influenza through the winter, and am not right even now. Then, to tell the truth, I have been so many years thinking and writing, that I am fairly tired. Three years ago my essay on Miracles nearly knocked me up. And last year my 'Notes on St. Athanasius' fairly did so. I always determined when they were done, to give myself a respite for some months, and a medical friend, on whom I have long relied, spoke very strong things on the necessity of it. Well, hardly was St. Athanasius over when it broke upon me that I must write a book on the subject I mentioned to you, and never has anything cost me (I think) so much hard thought and anxiety, though when I got to the end of my 'Arians' thirteen years ago, I had no sleep for a week, and was fainting away or something like it, day after day. *Then* I went abroad and that set me up. At present I have been four months and more at my new work, and found I had vastly more materials than I knew how to employ. The difficulty was to bring them into shape, as well as to work out in my mind the principles on which they were to run. I spent two months in reading and writing which came to nothing, at least for my present purpose. I really have no hope that it will be finished before the autumn, if then. I have not written a sentence, I suppose, which will stand or hardly so. Perhaps one gets over-sensitive even about style, as one gets on in life. My utmost ambition in point of recreation, is to lay aside the actual writing for three weeks or so in the course of the time, and take to reading and hunting about. Our time is so divided here, that I have

not above six or seven hours at it, and it is so exhausting, I doubt whether I could give more. I am now writing it for the first time, and have done three chapters out of four or five. Besides re-writing, every part has to be worked out and defined as in moulding a statue. I get on, as a person walks with a lame ankle, who does get on, and gets to his journey's end, but not comfortably. Now, after all this you will expect the work to be something out of the way—alack, that is the worst of it—it is much cry and little wool. However, I must do my best, and then leave it. As hitherto I have never taken to heart what people said of my writings, I trust I shall not on this occasion. I was much interested and obliged by what you said about reports and how they were taken.

The following letter requires some explanation, and for this recourse must be had to Dr. Pusey's biographer. 'When at last it was forced upon him [*i.e.* Pusey] that Newman would become a Roman Catholic, he endeavoured to reconcile his own unswerving love of and deference for Newman with his absolute faith in the Presence of Christ with the English Church, by the supposition that Newman was, at any rate for a time, the subject of a special call or dispensation, having for its object the promotion of some great blessing or improvement in the Roman Church; and therefore that his secession was no more entitled to general imitation than was the mission of the Prophet Jonah to Nineveh. He could not bring himself to allow that Newman was doing wrong, though he held that it would have been wrong indeed in himself or any other member of the English Church to follow his example.'<sup>1</sup>

Such a strong hold did this idea get on his mind that he came to think Newman must share it, and wrote to ask his advice about a lady who was, as he would have regarded it, tempted to join the Church of Rome. 'Your case,' he said,

<sup>1</sup> *Life of Pusey*, vol. ii. p. 465. 'Such a position,' continues the biographer, 'is open to obvious criticisms; but the heart has a logic of its own, which is often, in point of courage and generosity, more than a match for that of the bare understanding.' This logic of the heart enabled Pusey, seven days after Newman's conversion, to publish in the *English Churchman* a letter which is a magnificent monument both of his love for Newman, and of his fortitude and generosity (*ibid.* pp. 400-403).

‘if so it is to be, I look upon as a special dispensation. I suppose, of course, that, if it is so, Almighty God is pleased to draw you for some office which He has for you.’

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. E. B. PUSEY

July 22, 1845.

My dear Pusey,—. . . As to the anxious matter which forms the second subject of your letter, perhaps I am a bad adviser for you—for one of my own tokens of firmness of conviction to myself has been the wish that others should do the same. Very unwilling indeed am I and distressed that they should act *because* I act, but if it is right for me, it is right for others. It is no special dispensation with me, certainly. One person is moved differently from another—some have been before me, others may be after me—in that sense every one is under a special dispensation—but in no other sense can I contemplate it as special. Were I in a system which I am not, and saw so clearly that it was salvation, and then found that another out of it were desirous to enter it, I should not ask if she had a warrant to enter, but whether there was anything *against* her entering, and I do not think I should consider any duty violated by her entering. At present, ‘Physician, heal thyself,’ is what sounds in my ears, and without going to longer questions, one is contented to give cautions against precipitancy, restlessness, etc., which indeed at no time can be out of place, but would be less prominent, did I see more than I can see just now.

Really I am just the worst person you could ask—for though nothing can be more axiomatic than that where persons have confidence in our Church they are safe, I have the greatest perplexity about the estate of those who have not that confidence, and think they may *wait* indeed on many accounts, but have no right to put aside what may be, what probably is a call.

You will see that I had better not answer your specific questions at all—and you may give easily as a reason that

it would be inconsistent in a person in my case giving any advice. I wrote the like to a lady a day or two ago.

The letter you send is a most impressive and distressing one to me. I dare not keep back my feeling about it, in spite of what I have said, and knowing too how it will pain you. I should really fear to be acting against the Truth in keeping her from what seems so to be intended for her. She gives a hint about rationalism—this perhaps is my weak point—but it frightens me.

Miss Lenthall departed last evening—I have just heard it—it has affected me much—she is my last link with St. Mary's.

Ever yours affectionately,  
J. H. N.

REV. J. KEBLE TO J. H. NEWMAN

October 3, 1845.

I feel as if I had something to say to you, although I don't very well know what it will be; but Charlotte's illness having for the present at least abated, I find that I am better able than I have been for near a fortnight past to think and speak coherently of other things, and what can I think of so much as you, dear friend, and the *ἀγωνία* which awaits us with regard to you: except, indeed, when my thoughts travel on to Bisley, to Tom's bedside, for there, as well as here, every thing almost seems to have been, perhaps to be, hanging by a thread.

At such times one seems in a way to see deeper into realities, and I must own to you that the impression on my own mind of the reality of the things I have been brought up among, and of its being my own fault not theirs, whereinsoever I am found wanting,—this impression seems to deepen in me as Death draws nearer, and I find it harder and harder to imagine that persons such as I have seen and heard of lately should be permitted to live and die deceiving themselves in such a point, as whether they are aliens to the grace of God's Sacraments or no.



October 11, midnight.<sup>1</sup> I had written thus far about a week ago, and then left off for very weariness, and, now that I was thinking of going on with my writing, I find that the thunderbolt has actually fallen upon us, and you have actually taken the step which we greatly feared.

I will not plague you, then, with what I might otherwise have set down—something which passed directly relating to yourself in what fell from my dear wife on this day fortnight, when in perfect tranquillity and self-possession, having received the Holy Communion, she took leave of us all, expecting hourly to sink away. By God's great mercy she revived, and still continues among us, with, I trust, increasing hopes of recovery; but the words which she spoke were such that I must always think of them as of the last words of a saint. Some of them I had thought of reporting to you, but this, at any rate, is not the time.

Wilson has told me how kindly you have been remembering us in our troubles; it was very kind, when you must have so much upon your own mind. Who knows how much good your prayers and those of other absent friends may have done us both here and at Bisley? For there too, as I dare say you know, has been a favourable change, and a more decided one, I imagine, than here—at least their doctor has told them they may make themselves comfortable, which is far beyond anything that has yet been said to us. But his recovery is very, very slow. There too, as well as here, everything has fallen out so as to foster the delusion, if delusion it be, that we are not quite aliens, not living among unrealities. Yet you have no doubt the other way. It is very mysterious, very bewildering indeed; but, being so, one's duty seems clearly pointed out: to abide where one is, till some new call come upon one. If this were merely my own reason or feeling, I should mistrust it altogether, knowing, alas! that I am far indeed from the person to whom guidance is promised, but when I see the faith of others, such as I know them to be, and so very near

<sup>1</sup> After he had received the news that Newman had left the Anglican Communion.

to me as God has set them, I am sure that it would be a kind of impiety but to dream of separating from them.

Besides the deep grief of losing you for a guide and helper, and scarce knowing which way to look, (though I trust, thanks (in good part), to your kindness in many ways I am not in so wretched a condition as I was), you may guess what uncomfortable feelings haunt me, as if I, more than any one else, was answerable for whatever of distress and scandal may occur. I keep on thinking, 'If I had been different, perhaps N. would have been guided to see things differently, and we might have been spared so many broken hearts and bewildered spirits.' To be sure, that cold hard way of going on, which I have mentioned to you before, stands my friend at such times, and hinders me, I suppose, from being really distressed; but this is how I feel that I ought to feel, and . . . I tell you . . . and how I wish you to help me. That way of help, at any rate, is not forbidden you in respect of any one of us.

My dearest Newman, you have been a kind and helpful friend to me in a way in which scarce any one else could have been, and you are so mixed up in my mind with old and dear and sacred thoughts, that I cannot well bear to part with you, most unworthy as I know myself to be; and yet I cannot go along with you. I must cling to the belief that we are not really parted—you have taught me so, and I scarce think you can unteach me—and, having relieved my mind with this little word, I will only say God bless you and reward you a thousandfold all your help in every way to me unworthy, and to so many others. May you have peace where you are gone, and help us in some way to get peace; but somehow I scarce think it will be in the way of controversy. And so, with somewhat of a feeling as if the Spring had been taken out of my year,

I am, always, your affectionate and grateful,

J. KEBLE.

J. H. NEWMAN TO REV. E. B. PUSEY

My dear Pusey,—I have written to the Provost to-day to resign my fellowship. Anything may happen to me now any day. Anyhow, believe me,

My dear Pusey,  
Yours most affectionately ever,  
J. H. N.

The Provost, Dr. Hawkins, did not receive Newman's letter till the 6th, for he was away from Oxford. His reply was, as might be expected, kind and courteous. Professions of regret were out of the question. He had repeatedly shown in the most aggressive fashion that in his opinion Newman had no right to the position which he held.<sup>1</sup> But he managed delicately to suggest that there was still time for him to reconsider his resignation.

DR. HAWKINS TO J. H. NEWMAN

Stoke's Bay Cottage,  
Alverstoce, Hants,  
October 6, 1845.

My dear Newman,—Your letter of the 3rd enclosing the Resignation of your Fellowship, and desiring me to withdraw your name, has only reached me this evening.

The form of Resignation is quite correct; and, if I hear nothing further from you to the contrary, I must of course comply with your desire and withdraw your name from our books upon my return to Oriel.

You say nothing of your present position or intentions. Possibly you are thinking of retiring into Lay Communion;

<sup>1</sup> The following is a piece of contemporary evidence which seems worth preserving. It is from a pamphlet entitled '*A Short Appeal to Members of Convocation upon the proposed Censure of Tract 90*. By Frederic Rogers, Fellow of Oriel (London, 1845).' 'Dr. Hawkins, one of the leading promoters of these measures, cannot object to my alluding to the fact that he certainly endeavours to render its [*i.e.* Tract 90] abjuration a condition of admission to Holy Orders—to Fellowships—to Preferments—to employment in the University; and this on the alleged ground of its condemnation by the Hebdomadal Board, and in Bishops' Charges. If the attempt is not always successful, it is, in some measure, from want of authority.'

and against this, if you hold the opinions which I suppose, I could say nothing. But your letter is so strong a confirmation of the rumours I have heard of your intention to join the Church of Rome, that I venture to write to you as if it were so. And indeed in any other case, where I could speak officially or as a friend, I should do what I could to dissuade any member, much more any minister, of the Church of England, from what you know I cannot but regard as very grievous error. It is not from want of regard for you, if I forbear to say anything in your case, but only because I despair of doing any good, when you have been so long studying all questions of this kind; and indeed much more, and more anxiously, no doubt, than I have myself.

And yet I cannot forbear expressing the most earnest hope (in all sincerity and with feelings of real kindness), that whatever course you may have resolved upon, you may still at least be saved from some of the worst errors of the Church of Rome, such as praying to human Mediators or falling down before images—because in you, with all the great advantages with which God has blessed and tried you, I must believe such errors to be most deeply sinful. But may He protect you!

Believe me always, My dear Newman,  
Sincerely yours,

EDWD. HAWKINS.

Newman always thought of Dr. Hawkins with affection and gratitude. He dwells in the 'Apologia' upon his indebtedness to him. 'He was the first who taught me to weigh my words, and to be cautious in my statements'; and in a higher order, 'As to doctrine he was the means of great additions to my belief.' 'I can say with a full heart that I love him and have never ceased to love him.'<sup>1</sup>

On Wednesday, October 8, Father Dominic came to Littlemore. On the following day, Newman entered in his journal: 'Father Dominic, Dalgairns, and St. John went to Oxford to mass—completed my confession—admitted

<sup>1</sup> *Apologia*, p. 8.

into the Catholic Church with Bowles and Stanton—[wrote] to J.,<sup>1</sup> Mrs. Wood, H. B[owden], Woodgate, Badeley, E. Coleridge, I. Williams, Wilson, Dr. Russell, Faber, Belaney, F.,<sup>2</sup> M. R. G.,<sup>3</sup> Allies, Mrs. W. F[roude], Rogers, Rivington, Pusey, Anderdon, Manning, Barter, H. W[ilberforce], Miss Parker, Dodsworth, Mrs. Bowden, Watts Russell, R. Williams, Church, Capes, Dear.'

To the world at large his valedictory words, eloquent of the deep calm which had settled upon his mind, were the sentence appended to the uncompleted 'Essay on Development':

'Such were the thoughts concerning the "Blessed Vision of Peace," of one whose long-continued petition had been that the Most Merciful would not despise the work of His own Hands, nor leave him to himself;—while yet his eyes were dim, and his breast laden, and he could but employ Reason in the things of Faith. And now, dear Reader, time is short, eternity is long. Put not from you what you have here found; regard it not as mere matter of present controversy; set not out resolved to refute it, and looking out for the best way of doing so; seduce not yourself with the imagination that it comes of disappointment, or disgust, or restlessness, or wounded feeling, or undue sensibility, or other weakness. Wrap not yourself round in the associations of years past; nor determine that to be truth which you wish to be so, nor make an idol of cherished anticipations. Time is short, eternity is long.

Nunc dimittis servum tuum, Domine,  
 Secundum verbum tuum in pace;  
 Quia viderunt oculi mei salutare tuum.'

And those whom Newman left, and who never followed him—gratitude and love seemed to overcome all sense of the injury he had done to their cause by abandoning it. The greater number of them, if they had survived him, would, we may be sure, have gladly subscribed to the noble and courageous tribute paid to his memory, immediately after his death, by the *Guardian*:

'Cardinal Newman is dead, and we lose in him not only one of the very greatest masters of English style, not only a man of singular beauty and purity of character, not only an

<sup>1</sup> His sister, Mrs. J. Mozley (her Christian name was Jemima).

<sup>2</sup> Probably his brother, Francis Newman.      <sup>3</sup> Miss Giberne.

eminent example of personal sanctity, but the founder, we may almost say, of the Church of England as we see it. What the Church of England would have become without the Tractarian movement we can faintly guess, and of the Tractarian movement Newman was the living soul and the inspiring genius. Great as his services have been to the communion in which he died, they are as nothing by the side of those he rendered to the communion in which the most eventful years of his life were spent. All that was best in Tractarianism came from him—its reality, its depth, its low estimate of externals, its keen sense of the importance of religion to the individual soul. The conclusions to which it led him were different from those to which it led his most devoted followers, but the premisses from which they started and the temper in which they worked were identical, and whatever solid success the High Church party have obtained since Cardinal Newman's departure has been due to their fidelity to his method and spirit. He will be mourned by many in the Roman Church, but their sorrow will be less than ours, because they have not the same paramount reason to be grateful to him.'<sup>1</sup>

What was the source of the influence Newman had upon those who came in contact with him during his Oxford days? This is the answer given by one who lived with him at Littlemore, the late Father William Lockhart. Unfortunately we cannot give his actual words, but only a report of them:<sup>2</sup>

'To put into one sentence what struck him as the character of Newman's whole teaching and influence, it was to make them use their reasoning powers, to seek after the last satisfactory reason one could reach of everything, and this led them to the last reason of all, and they formed a religious personal belief in God the Creator, our Lord and Master. This was the first thing that Newman did for those young men under his care. He rooted in their hearts and minds a personal conviction of the living God. And he for one could say he never had that feeling of God before he was brought into contact with Cardinal Newman. . . . It was when Newman read the Scriptures from the lectern

<sup>1</sup> *The Guardian*, August 13, 1890.

<sup>2</sup> Quoted from *Cardinal Newman*, a monograph, by John Oldcastle (London: John Simkins, n.d.).

in St. Mary's Church at Oxford that one felt more than ever that his words were those of a seer who saw God and the things of God. Many men were impressive readers, but they did not reach the soul. They played on the senses and imagination, they were good actors, they did not forget themselves, and one did not forget them. But Newman had the power of so impressing the soul as to efface himself; you thought only of the majestic soul that saw God. It was God speaking to you as He speaks through creation; but in a deeper way by the articulate voice of man made to the image of God and raised to His likeness by grace, communicating to your intelligence and sense and imagination, by words which were the signs of ideas, a transcript of the work and private thoughts which were in God.'





## APPENDIX

### I (p. 81)

THE greater part of the following letter, which is in Keble College Library, was published in the *Guardian* of December 7, 1916, by the Rev. Dr. Lock, Warden of Keble College. Through the kindness of Dr. Lock we are able to print the entire letter :

My dear Perceval,—Many thanks for your kind note just received. I certainly am at this instant in a pretty considerable scrape, but am only surprised at the long run of luck we have had.

The Tract was necessary to keep people either from Rome or schism or an uncomfortable conscience. It was necessary for my own peace so much as this, that I felt people *did not know me*, and were trusting me when otherwise they would not. I really cannot repent having done it. As to the newspapers, it is a curious coincidence—but all these things will turn to good. The Tract was in print, not to say published, before the papers opened the subject.

I did not think it would have made a noise. I expected it to come in quietly—and it would, but for two things—first Golightly, who is the Fire-the-Faggot of the affair, and who would be pleased to know I felt him to be so—and secondly, Lord Morpeth's speech in the House the other night.

Repeating my thanks, I am,

My dear Perceval,

Yrs. affectionately,

J. H. NEWMAN.

Oriel : March 12/41.

P.S.—Mr. Pauli is a Christian and has been Pusey's assistant in Hebrew and takes Pupils here. He is well thought of, I believe.

Palmer, I am glad to say, quite sanctions the Tract.

### II

*There was no trace of Calvinistic teaching in Newman's home.*  
We are able to make this statement on the authority of the

Cardinal's nephew, Mr. J. B. Mozley, who has kindly allowed us to refer to him by name. 'You are at liberty,' he writes, 'to refer to me as giving my *mother's* evidence that the teaching in the Cardinal's home was not either Calvinistic or Evangelical; I think it was soon after the publication of the "Apologia" that she said this to me.' Mr. Mozley and his brother, Mr. Frank Mozley, have also given us the following statement made by Francis Newman to the latter, and noted down by him while it was fresh in his memory :

'My father was somewhat free-thoughted, fond of seeing what different people had to say for their opinions. A reader and admirer of the works of Barclay the Quaker, he could not bear John Newton, in whose parish, St. Benet Fink, he lived, on account of his connection with the slave trade, and perhaps his Calvinism. He was a Whig, despised the city companies, and never cared to take up his freedom, though it might have done him some little good in his bank. He was of independent mind, and looked at things from his own point of view, but, having no political influence, did not say much. My mother and grandmother (Newman) taught us simple piety, the non-controversial points of Christianity on which all agreed. They would never have taught Calvinism.'<sup>1</sup>

There is also evidence in some private memoranda of the Cardinal's, written when his Evangelicalism was at its height, that his mother did not share his views.

To Mr. Mozley we are also indebted for the following reference to the first page of Francis Newman's 'Phases of Faith,' from which it would seem that (1) Mr. Mayers was an exception among the masters at Ealing, and that (2) the tone of the boys there was not markedly religious :

'I first began to read religious books at school, and especially the Bible, when I was eleven years old ;<sup>2</sup> and almost immediately contracted a habit of secret prayer. But it was not until I was fourteen that I gained any definite idea of a "scheme of doctrine," or could have been called "a converted person" by one of the

<sup>1</sup> Compare the account given by the Cardinal in the *Apologia* of his home training : 'I was brought up from a child to take a great delight in reading the Bible. . . . Of course I had a perfect knowledge of my Catechism.'

<sup>2</sup> Francis Newman was born in June 1805; his brother, the future Cardinal, in February 1801. 'When I was fifteen (in the Autumn of 1816),' writes the latter, 'a great change of thought took place in me. I fell under the influences of a definite creed' (*Apologia*, p. 4). This would have been when his brother Francis was eleven.

Evangelical school. My religion then certainly exerted a general influence over my conduct ; for I soon underwent various persecutions from my schoolfellows on account of it. . . . An Evangelical clergyman at the school gained my affections, and from him I imbibed more and more distinctly the full creed which distinguishes that body of men.'

It only remains to add that the conversion of individual members of a family to Evangelicalism, as happened in the case of the two Newmans, was not an unusual event in the early part of the last century.



## INDEX

- ACLAND, T. D., 142  
 Alexander, Bishop, 145.  
 Allies, Mr., 159, 196  
 American Church: admission of Nestorians to communion, 23, 194; Mr. Carey's ordination, 253  
 Anderdon, 237  
 Andrewes, Bishop, 164, 314  
 Anglican Church:—  
 Articles of religion—their un-catholic *animus*: the thesis of Tract XC, 72; critical principles of the tract summarised, 75; relation to the *Via Media*, 76; Newman maintains legitimacy of his interpretation, 76; Pusey's suggestions to Newman, 82; Newman's note to Pusey's letter, 85; Hook's letter to Newman, 87; Newman's letter to the *Times* in 1863 repudiating Mr. Maurice's accusations, 109; Newman's correspondence with Keble on Catholic subscription, 138; Rev. Ambrose St. John's correspondence with Newman, 240; Newman's letter resigning St. Mary's, 262; correspondence with Manning, 272; incompatible with Roman doctrine: Newman's correspondence with Keble, 360 *et seq.*; Newman on Ward's 'Ideal,' 361 *et seq.*; correspondence with J. R. Hope, 380; test at Oxford, the proposed, *see* Oxford University—Test  
 Catholicity—effect of Newman's study of the Monophysite Controversy on his opinions, 1 *et seq.*; his early contentions, 8; the reply to Dr. Wiseman, 15; his change of view, 21, 26; Tractarian position, 74; Dr. Russell's correspondence with Newman, 126, 128; effect of Newman's studies of Arian controversy, 133; his letter to Mrs. J. Mozley, 153; correspondence with Hope, 157; Hope's letter to Gladstone, 157; Newman's letters to Rev. W. Dodsworth, 162, 188; the letter to a layman, 185; correspondence with Keble on his changed opinions, 217, 222, 225, 231, 242, 255, 259, 266; correspondence with Manning, 271 *et seq.*; correspondence with J. R. Hope, 281; Keble's suggestion *re* recovery through Primitive Catholicity, 298; Newman's letter to J. R. Hope: his experiences unfavourable to her Catholicity, 310; letter to E. L. Badeley, 326; Newman's correspondence with Keble on Ward's 'Ideal,' 362  
 Donatists, Dr. Wiseman's parallel with, 13, 26, 34–5, 38, 49  
 Four theological schools, Tait's account of, 95  
 Heretical character, 21, 26, 133; Newman's correspondence with Keble, 138; with E. L. Badeley, 327; with Rev. E. Coleridge, 345  
 Rome, secessions to—fears concerning the Oxford Movement, 30, 53; Newman's correspondence on the Oxford Movement, 147–8, 152 *et seq.*; with J. R. Hope, 157, 164; with S. F. Wood, 161; with Rev. W. Dodsworth, 162, 188; letter to a layman, 185; correspondence with Keble *re* resignation of St. Mary's (references to his influence in direc-

- tion of Rome), 210, 216; on changed religious opinions, 217, 222, 227, 231, 242; Rev. Ambrose St. John's correspondence with Newman, 240; Lockhart's and other secessions, 248, 250, 252, 256, 257, 258; Newman's letter to Rev. F. W. Faber, 253; to an unknown correspondent, on his own position, 268; Newman's correspondence with J. R. Hope on the 'Lives of the English Saints,' 281; unsettlement of others by Newman's changing views, 294-5, 317, 343, 346, 354, 359; correspondence with Keble, 296 *et seq.*, 316 *et seq.*; effect of his sermons on a young lady, 300; Newman's correspondence with a clergyman: contradicts statement that he had gone over to Rome, 309; rumours of Newman's intended secession, 339; subsequent correspondence, 339 *et seq.*; correspondence with Badeley, 344; Lockhart's mother on her son's restful state, 378; Newman urges Oakeley to consider question: letter to J. R. Hope, 379; correspondence with Pusey on case of a young lady, 383; Keble's letter to Newman on learning of his secession, 384; Newman's diary references to his conversion, 388
- Tokens—Newman's correspondence with Keble on 'Sermons on Subjects of the Day,' 252, 256, 257, 259, 264
- Anglican and Roman Churches, differences between—the root of divergence, 7, 11; motive of Tract XC discussed, 72 *et seq.*; correspondence between Dr. Russell and Newman, 118-129; between Dr. Wiseman and Newman, 129-132
- Reunion—Ward and Oakeley's aspirations: Newman's note to Pusey, 197
- Anglican Difficulties, Lectures on,* 368
- Anglican theology—Newman on the objective view of Truth, 11; difficulty respecting the General Councils, 12-13
- Anglo-Catholics, 95
- Anti-Catholic statements, 1; retraction of, 202
- Anti-Christ—Newman and Dr. Todd's discourses, 49, 50
- Antinomianism, 111
- Antioch, Great Council of, 25
- 'A.P.P.,' 305
- 'Apologia'—the five chapters of Newman's religious opinions, 165
- Apostolic succession, 27, 96, 351
- Arian controversy and Arianism, 24, 133, 182, 219
- Arius, 182
- Arminianism—Thomas Scott accused of, 111
- Arnold, Dr., 22, 216, 318, 321, 324, 349
- Articles of religion, Anglican. *See* Anglican Church—Articles
- Asceticism, 356
- Ashworth, 228
- Atkinson, Mr., 52
- Atonement—Newman's letter to a correspondent, 205-7
- Augsburg Confession, 171
- Authority, 7-8, 11, 102, 162-3, 194-5. *See also* Pope—Authority
- BABINGTON, G., 175, 341
- Badeley, Edward Lowth (Newman's friend and legal adviser), 68, 180, 288, 367; Newman's correspondence with, on the sermon on 'Implicit and Explicit Reason,' 69; consoling him on recent misfortune, 138; on Convocation and the King of Prussia, 180; on Lutheranism and heresy, 182; Pusey's sermon and suspension, 234, 326; lenient attitude of Church authorities towards Low Churchmen, 327; Newman's religious convictions, 329; requesting him to purchase books, 337, 340, 344; the Master's action against Ward, 338
- Bagot, Rt. Rev. Dr., Bishop of Oxford—correspondence with Newman on Mr. Bloxam's indiscretion, 42-47; on Tract XC, 88-9; proposes cessation of the Tracts and suppression of Tract XC, 99; yields over Tract XC; Newman undertakes to discontinue Tracts, 102; acknowledgment of Newman's letter, 103; Newman's letter resigning St.

- Mary's, 262; Newman's correspondence with Manning on his Charge, 272
- Balguy, 126
- Bandinel, 59
- Baptism, 83, 86, 93, 96; Pusey's Tract, 177; Newman on adult baptism, 178; McGhee and Newman's sermon, 191; baptismal regeneration, 191, 207, 351
- Barclay the Quaker, 394
- Barrow, 228
- Bath clergyman, a, on Tract XC, 106
- Bede—Newman's proposal that Keble should write his life, 215, 216, 222, 283; 'Rome the Mother Church,' 285
- Bellarmino, 120
- Bellasis, Serjeant Edward—memorandum reference to Robert Williams, 36; on Tract XC, 97; on the Evangelical address against the Tracts, 169 *et seq.*, 173; the suggested legal action, 183-5; the troubles at Lambeth, 189; Newman thanks him for note on Life of St. Stephen, 313; supports Oakeley in Court of Arches, 367
- Berengarius, abjuration and retraction of, 120
- Berens, Archdeacon, 323
- Bernard, Dr., 334, 335
- Beveridge, Bishop—'Private Thoughts,' 115-17
- Bishop, the invisible—St. Ignatius on, 147
- Bishops:—
- Authority—Newman's view of, 102
  - Gifts of the episcopate—Newman on his studies of the Fathers, 196
  - Grace, episcopal, 139
- Bishops, Anglican, and the Tractarians, 90 *et seq.*, 138, 162, 164, 171, 184; growing unanimity against Tract XC, 211, 214; Keble on their charges, 216; Newman's reply, 227; Newman's correspondence with Manning, 272; Newman's fears concerning 'Lives of the English Saints,' 289; Gladstone's suggestions to Manning *re* Newman, 293; a bishop's claim that Newman's adherents are dwindling, 294; Newman's letter to Badeley on the condemnation of Pusey's sermon, 327
- Blomfield, Bishop of London, 52, 90-1, 147, 184; correspondence with Hook on Tract XC, 90; and Pusey, 233
- Blowell, 350
- Bloxam, Mr. John Rouse, 40, 61; 'Bloxam's escapade': Newman's correspondence with Rev. W. Dodsworth and Bishop of Oxford, 40-47; Newman's accounts to Bowden, 47, 53
- Bossuet, 124, 126
- Bowden, Mr. J. W.—ill-health, 33, 222, 244, 266, 299, 301; Newman's letters to, 36, 47, 51, 53, 66; engaged on 'Lives of the English Saints,' 227; Newman's correspondence with Keble on his condition, 322, 324, 328, 330, 331; death, 333
- Bowden, Mrs. 323, 325, 332, 334, 336, 370, 373
- Bowler, 215
- Bowyer, 160
- Bramhall, Bishop, 189
- Breviary, Roman—used at Littlemore, 295; R. Williams' plan, 306-7
- Brewer, 222, 228
- Bridges, 228
- Bright, Dr.—tribute to Newman's work on St. Athanasius, 152
- British Critic*—Thomas Mozley's editorship: Newman's correspondence with Keble, 134-7; R. Palmer's (of Worcester) protest, 249, 258; reference to it having stopped, 288
- British Magazine* and the 'Sermons on Subjects of the Day,' 307
- Broad Churchmen. *See* Low Churchmen
- Brougham, Lord, 142
- Buchanan—discovery of a Monophysite creed anathematising Chalcedonians, 10
- Bull's 'Defensio F.N.,' 197
- Bunsen, M., 142 *et seq.*; judgment on Newman's 'Arians,' 143; Jerusalem Bishopric scheme, 142 *et seq.*
- Burnet, on the Anglican Articles, 72, 84
- Burns, Mr., 164
- Burton, 197
- Butler, Bishop, 256, 320, 351

- Sick, and Absolution 93; Tait's views, 96; and the Oxford movement, 112; Newman opposed to their system, 114; and Calvinism, 115; attitude to Jerusalem Bishopric scheme, 147; Cheltenham address to Archbishop of Canterbury denouncing Tracts for the Times, 169; Newman on the defections to Non-conformists, 185; Newman on subjectivism in religion, 253; early position of John Henry and Francis Newman, 394
- Exeter, Bishop of, 172, 179, 195, 211
- FABER, Mr., 214
- Faber, Rev. F. W.—Newman's correspondence with: on secessions to Rome, 253; on Invocation, 356
- Faber of Magdalen, 39
- Faber of University College, 227
- Faith, the Rule of, 207
- Faussett, Dr., Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, 49, 134-7, 226; Thomas Mozley's reply to his attack on Tract XC, 134-7
- Forbes, 183
- Forgiveness of sins, 29, 207
- Formby, Mr., 158, 337, 340
- Friend, a—letter to Newman on his reported intention of joining Roman Church, 339
- Froude—account of Newman's refusal to see Manning, 280
- Froude, Archdeacon, 140, 217
- Froude, James Anthony, 32
- Froude, R. Hurrell, 11, 49, 67, 176, 203, 214, 224, 351, 372-3
- Froude, W., 362
- Froude, Mrs. William—correspondence with Newman: on letter to Bishop of Oxford agreeing to discontinue Tracts, 103; Newman's progress, Lockhart, and the Essay on Development, 377, 380
- Fundamentals, the doctrine of, 1
- GAISFORD, 344
- Geddes, 22
- Gentili, Dr., 248, 250, 259
- Gibbon, 366
- Giesler's text-book of ecclesiastical history, 366
- Gilbert, 37
- Gilby, Mr., 214
- Gladstone, W. E., and the Jerusalem Bishopric, 157, 162, 171-2, 183; and the Tractarian aspirations for reunion with Rome, 198 *et seq.*; on Newman's correspondence with Manning, 273, 278; Newman's letters to J. R. Hope concerning the 'Lives of the English Saints,' 286, 288 *et seq.*, 310; suggests influences should be exerted to keep Newman in the Anglican Church, 293; fails to shake Newman's convictions concerning Rome, 350; article in the *Quarterly* against Ward, 368; attitude towards the grant to Maynooth: correspondence with Newman, 375
- Gloucestershire Rector, a, on Tract XC, and Newman's letter to Bishop of Oxford, 105
- Golightly, 79, 86, 393
- Gorham case, the, 68
- Government, the, and the Jerusalem Bishopric: league with Bishops against Tractarians, 184; Newman on State conscience, 375
- Grace—Newman's letter to Rev. A. Tarbutt, 177
- Grant, Rev. Ignatius, 186, 258-9
- Greswold, Bishop, 194
- Griffiths, Mr. (one of the Four Senior Tutors), 93
- Guardian*, Newman's obituary notice in, 389
- Guillemard, Mr., 367
- HADDAN, 222, 228
- Hallam, Mr., 162
- Harrington, Dr., 324, 344
- Harrington, Mrs., 323
- Harris, 228
- Hawkins, Dr., the Provost of Oriel, 79, 351; letter to Newman on his resignation and secession to Roman Church, 387; F. Rogers on his attitude towards Tract XC, 387
- Hebdomadal Board. *See under* Oxford University
- Heeren, 366
- Henoticon of Zeno, the, 5
- Henry VIII, the Act of, 175
- Heresy—heretical character of Anglican Church. *See* Anglican



- Church—Heretical character. Newman's correspondence: with Keble on Catholic subscription, 138; with Mrs. S. F. Wood, 159; with Badeley on Lutheranism, 182
- Hermesianer, 97
- High Church party—attitude towards Jerusalem Bishopric scheme, 147
- Hoadley, 126
- Homilies*, the, Tract XC, and, 75
- Hong-Kong mission scheme, 213
- Höninghaus' 'Wanderings through the Domain of Protestant Literature,' 128
- Hook, Dr. W. F., 30, 53, 81, 171; on Oxford Movement and the danger of defections to Rome, 30; attitude towards Jerusalem Bishopric, 147; Newman's correspondence with, on Tract XC, 37, 90, 99
- Hooker's 'Fifth Book,' 197
- Hope, Mr. J. R., 56, 58-61, 67, 326, 367; attitude on Jerusalem Bishopric scheme, 144; pamphlet, 145; letter to Gladstone, 157; Newman's correspondence with, on Magdalen Statutes, 58-61; Catholicity of Anglican Church, 157; Jerusalem bishopric, 161, 183; Roman tendencies, 164; Convocation and the Poetry Professorship, 172; dispensations, 175; address to King of Prussia, 179; residence, 190; position of Tractarians, 191; Scotch Church, American Church, and Nestorians, 194; Newman thanks him for sending books, 204; secessions to Rome, 258; the 'Lives of the English Saints,' 280 *et seq.*, 311; doubts of Catholicity of English Church, 311; bias, 312; Newman's suggestion to Oakeley *vs* Roman Church, 380
- 'House' or 'Hall,' the, 39
- IDOLATROUS usages.** See Images
- Images and relics, honours and reverence to—Tract XC and, 76, 123-4; Hook's letter to Newman, 88; Newman's correspondence, with Dr. Russell, 123-4; with Dr. Wiseman, 131; his admission in 1843, 169; correspondence with Keble on the Second Commandment, 303, 304
- Incumbents—responsibility to their bishop: Bishop of Oxford's correspondence with Newman on Mr. Bloxam's indiscretion, 45-7
- Indulgences, 76, 123-4
- Infidelity—Newman's fears as to effect of his changed views on others, 317
- Ireland, the Primate of, 92
- JANSENISTS, 173**
- Jarvis, Dr., 194
- Jeffreys, H., 38, 52, 330
- Jelf, Dr., Newman's letter vindicating Tract XC, 71, 80, 86, 147, 167; Pusey and, 82; the postscript, 90; attitude of Heads of Houses, 90; Newman's assurances to Dr. Wiseman, 129, 132; anti-Catholic statements retracted, 203
- Jenkyns, 214
- Jerusalem Bishopric scheme, 9, 70, 133-164; Mr. Walter informs Newman of the project, 141; Newman's letter to Keble, 142; Pusey's attitude, 143; Samuel Wilberforce's attitude, 144; Newman's correspondence, 142, 144 *et seq.*, 151, 157, 158, 159, 163; attitude of British Government, 146; attitude of Evangelicals and High Churchmen, 147; Newman's unpublished letter to *The Times*, 149; J. R. Hope's letter to Gladstone, 157; Convocation and the Address to the King of Prussia, 179, 183; Gladstone's withdrawal from the Trust, 183; W. Palmer and, 217
- Protest, Newman's, 144, 156, 159, 179, 180
- Jewel, Bishop—Oakeley's article in the *British Critic*, 135
- Jewish Church—St. Paul's unsettling effect on, 301
- Jews, Conversion of—the Jerusalem Bishopric scheme, 143
- Johnson, 228
- Julius I, Pope, 25
- Justification, 116, 139, 177, 182, 192, 196, 207
- Justin Martyr, 196

- KAYE, Bishop, 197
- Keble, John, 35, 49, 79, 176; relations with Bishop over Rev. P. Young, 134, 136-7, 140; position in regard to Bishop of Winchester's charge, 156; disgusted with Gladstone over Williams and the Poetry professorship, 172; Newman on his character, 209;—Newman's correspondence with: on Bishop of Oxford's proposal to discontinue Tracts, 100; editorship of *British Critic*, 134; Jerusalem bishopric, 142, 147; Scotch Church and Pusey's family, 195; Newman's explanations of erasures in Keble's letters, 208; on Newman's proposed resignation from St. Mary's and his changing religious views, 210, 215, 217, 222, 225, 231, 242, 244, 248, 250, 252, 254, 259-60; death of Wood, 215; the secessions to Rome, 237, 248-9, 250, 251; Sermons on Subjects of the Day, 246, 249, 255, 257, 259, 263, 266, 301 *et seq.*; on Newman's resignation from St. Mary's, 266; on Newman's doubts as to duty to continue in Anglican communion, 296 *et seq.*, 313 *et seq.*, 347 *et seq.*; Bowden's ill-health, 322-31 *passim*; Bowden's death, 334 *et seq.*; Newman contradicts rumour as to his intention to join Roman Church, 340; Keble's reply, 347; on Ward's 'Ideal' and the action of the authorities, 361 *et seq.*, 368 *et seq.*; birthday felicitations, 372; Keble's letter on learning of Newman's secession, 384  
"Catholic subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles," letter on—Newman's letter to him as to heresy, 138
- Keble, Mrs. John, 362, 364, 371, 384-5
- Keble, Thomas, 261, 266, 299, 331, 384
- Kildare, Bishop of, 92
- Knox, 256
- LAKE, 228
- Lambeth, the troubles at (1842), 189, 190
- Latrocinium. *See* Ephesus, Council of, 3
- Lauda Sion*, 118
- Law's 'Serious Call,' 115
- Layman, a—Newman's letter on the danger of Anglican defections to Rome, 185; letter to Newman on his religious doubts, 353
- Leibnitz, 117, 124, 126
- Lenthall, Miss, 384
- Lewis, Mr., 38, 228, 333
- Lisle, Philipps de, 40, 132
- Littlemore—Newman reorganises school, 61; Newman's desire to retain Littlemore, 212, 216; expresses disappointment to Keble, 217; gifts to the Church at, 230; Newman's life at: time table, 295; observance of Lent (1844), 296; Newman's letter to J. R. Hope and Dodsworth on the retreat, 310, 311  
'Lives of the English Saints,' 215, 216, 228, 231; Pusey and, 280; Newman's correspondence with J. R. Hope, 280 *et seq.*, 310
- Lloyd, Bishop, 197
- Lloyd, Mr., 91
- Lockhart, William (afterwards Father William Lockhart), 215, 228; secession to Rome, 248, 250, 256, 258; subsequent restful state: mother's letter to Newman, 377-8; on Newman's influence at Oxford, 390
- London, Bishop of. *See* Blomfield, Bishop of London  
'Loss and Gain,' quoted, 200, 230, 359 *n.*
- Low Church party, Tait on, 96; defections to dissenting bodies, 185; authorities and, 327. *See also* Evangelicals
- Lushington, Dr.—judgment in Court of Arches on 'passing by,' 93
- Luther, 180
- Lutheranism, Newman on heresy of, 182
- MACDONALD, 87
- McGhee, Mr.—Newman and his challenge to a public disputation, 191
- MacMullen, 228
- Magdalen College—the contraversy over the Statutes, 56-61
- Maitland, Dean, 50
- Malta, the proposed bishopric at, 54

- Maltby, Rt. Rev. E., Bishop of Durham, 214
- Manchester and Salford Protestant Reformation Society, 309
- Manning, Archdeacon, 49, 85, 102, 171, 176, 180, 183, 301, 350; correspondence with Newman, on the resignation of St. Mary's, 271 *et seq.*; on 'Sermons on Subjects of the Day,' 290 *et seq.*; the sermon of Nov. 5, and Newman's refusal to see him, 280
- Marcian, Emperor, 3
- Marriage—mixed marriage question in Russia, 38; Newman's letter to Rev. W. Dodsworth, 193
- Marriott, Charles, 141, 217, 330, 333
- Martyrs' Memorial, the, 176
- Masses, the *Sacrifice* of, 181
- Matthison, 37
- Maurice, Mr.—Newman's letter to *The Times* repudiating accusations concerning Tract XC, 109
- Maye, Dr., 215
- Mayers, Rev. Walter, 113, 394; his influence on Newman, 113 *et seq.*
- Maynooth grant, the, 375
- Medley, 349
- Melancthon, 175, 180, 182
- Meyrick, 228, 331
- Miles, 215
- Mill, Dr., 147, 156
- Miller, John, 319, 323, 326
- Mills, Mr., 215
- Milman, 370
- Miracles, 243; the 'Essay on Ecclesiastical Miracles,' 243; Newman's correspondence with Hope, 282-3
- Moberly, Rev. G. (later Bishop of Salisbury), 80, 324, 349; letter to Rev. R. W. Church on Tract XC, 80
- Möhler, 97
- Monastery, Newman's suggestion for a, 172. *See also* Littlemore
- Monasticism, 308
- Monophysite controversy—Newman's studies in 1839, 1, 9; the controversy outlined, 2; proceedings at Ephesus and Chalcedon, 3 *et seq.*; the two types of dissidents, Eutychians and Monophysites, 5; difficulty over the term *Physis*, 6; Newman recognises the difficulty of the *Via Media*, 9; his comment on the definition of Chalcedon, 10, 24; the parallel to modern controversy, 13, 24; Newman admits effect of his studies on his views, 17-26, 276; Newman's references in letters on the Jerusalem Bishopric scheme, 151, 156; on Lutheranism, 182; correspondence with Keble, 219
- Morpeth, Lord, 87, 393
- Morris, Mr., of Exeter—Newman on his extravagances at St. Mary's, 36-7, 39, 348
- Morris, Rev. T. E.—in the sermon referring to 'Laud, the martyred Archbishop,' 189, 229
- Mosheim, 366
- Mozley, Mr. Frank, 394
- Mozley, Mr. J., 35, 52, 228, 330, 349
- Mozley, Mrs. J.—Newman's correspondence with: on discontinuance of Tracts, 108; the Jerusalem Bishopric scheme, 151; retractation of anti-Catholic statements, 203
- Mozley, J. B., 39
- Mozley, Mr. J. B. (Newman's nephew) on Newman's home teaching, 394
- Mozley, Thomas, 68; editorship of *British Critic*: the article castigating Faussett, 134; Newman's correspondence with Keble, 134-7
- Mozley, Mrs. Thomas (Newman's sister), 135, 141
- Mules, 80
- Murray, 228
- Mysticism, 30, 175
- 'N'—letter to Newman urging hesitation ere seceding to Rome, 355
- Nestorians and Nestorian doctrine—the monk Theodosius' allegations, 5; the Monophysites and, 6; Newman's references on Jerusalem Bishopric project, 156; American Church and, 194
- Neville, Father William, 146, 280; account of Newman's refusal to see Manning, 280
- Newfoundland, Bishop of, 342
- Newman, John Henry—studies concerning Monophysite controversy: their effect on theory of *Via Media*, 1-9; recognises historical position of Roman Church and authority of Pope, 7; contentions as to Catholicity of English Church, 8; comment

on the definition at Chalcedon, 10; on Anglican theology and subjective view of truth, 11; explains his doubts to Rogers and H. Wilberforce, 14; reply to Dr. Wiseman and the 'Catholicity of English Church,' 15; change in religious views: explanatory memoranda, 16; draft letter to friend, 19; undated fragment tracing views during 1839-41, 23; letter to friend on Council of Chalcedon, 24; effect of sermons at St. Mary's, 28; attitude of authorities towards his adherents, 31; correspondence with Rev. W. Dodsworth and Bishop of Oxford *re* Mr. Bloxam's indiscretion, 41-7; the rise of the Tractarian movement, 27-69; the controversy over Tract XC, 70-110; Newman's obligations to Dr. Russell and Rev. T. Scott, 111; to Rev. W. Mayers, 113; never experienced conventional Evangelical conversion, 114; early religious influences, 115, 393; comparison with St. Philip Neri, 117; correspondence with Dr. Russell *re* Tract XC and Roman doctrine, 118, 129; correspondence with Dr. Wiseman on Anglican and Romish differences, 129-32; his three difficulties after termination of Tract XC affair, 133; correspondence with Keble on T. Mozley's editorship of *British Critic*, 134-7; on Keble's difficulties over Rev. P. Young, 136-140; on Keble's letter on 'Catholic Subscription' to the Articles, 138; *Catholicus* letters to *The Times* on Sir R. Peel's Tamworth address, 142; controversy over the Jerusalem bishopric, 141-64; unpublished letter to *The Times*, 149; letter to S. F. Wood correcting an account of a sermon, 160; growing difficulties, 165-201; the five periods of religious development evidenced in *Apologia*, 165; his position (1841-3), 166; fears claims of Rome may prove irresistible, 166; attitude towards Roman doctrine (1841-3), 166 *et seq.*; retracts anti-Catholic statements (1843), 168, 202 *et seq.*;

and the Martyrs' memorial, 176; contemplates resignation of St. Mary's, 204; correspondence with Keble (admits influence in direction of Rome and changing views), 208 *et seq.*, 215, 217, 222, 225, 234, 243, 244, 248, 255, 259, 261; letter to unknown correspondent on his position as regards Anglican and Roman Churches, 268; correspondence with Manning, 271 *et seq.*; letters to Hope on 'Lives of English Saints,' 280 *et seq.*; life at Littlemore (1844): time table, 294-5; position in 1844, 294 *et seq.*; effect of his changed views on others, 294-5, 317, 343, 346, 354, 359; one of his trials in Lent 1844; the prospect of having to join Church of Rome, 296; correspondence with Keble as to his doubts, 296 *et seq.*, 313 *et seq.*, 347 *et seq.*; correspondence with a clergyman: contradicts report that he had gone over to Rome, 309; his growing conviction that Roman communion is the true Church, 316; recalls experiences in Sicily, 315; letter to E. L. Badeley, 329; rumours of his secession to Rome, 339 *et seq.*; a friend's letter, 339; letter to Keble contradicting rumours, 340; letters from a stranger and an old schoolfellow, 341; correspondence with Rev. E. Coleridge, 342, 345; correspondence with E. L. Badeley, 344; his deep conviction that Christianity and the Roman system are convertible terms, 350; freedom from Roman influences, 345, 351; layman's letter urging hesitation ere seceding, 353; correspondence with Keble on Ward's 'Ideal': Anglican articles incompatible with Catholic doctrine, 360 *et seq.*; unfavourable view of present state of Roman Catholics, 364; determines on secession: effect of writing *Essay on Development*, 365; letters to Mrs. Froude, 378, 380; urges Oakeley to consider secession (letter to Keble), 379; Pusey and Newman's intended secession, 382; Newman's letter to Pusey on the case of a young lady, 383;

- Keble's letter on learning of Newman's intention, 384; admission into Roman Catholic Church, 388
- Journal—proposal to show it to Keble, 245 *et seq.*, 258, 260, 267
- Letters—to Rev. T. W. Allies, 196; to E. L. Badeley, 69, 137, 180, 234, 326, 329, 337, 340, 343; Serjeant Bellasis, 170, 173, 183-4, 189, 313; J. W. Bowden, 36, 47 *et seq.*, 66; Rev. J. F. Christie, 373; a Clergyman, 309; Rev. E. Coleridge, 342, 345; a Correspondent, 62 *et seq.*; J. B. Dalgairns, 213; Rev. W. Dodsworth, 41, 162, 181, 188, 193, 213, 233, 237, 311; Rev. F. W. Faber, 252, 356; a Friend (rough draft), 19; (extracts), 24; Mrs. W. Froude, 377, 380; W. E. Gladstone, 375; Rev. W. F. Hook, 90, 99; J. R. Hope, 58 *et seq.*, 144, 158, 161, 164, 171, 175, 179, 182, 190, 205, 258, 280 *et seq.*, 310, 312, 379; Dr. Jelf, 84, 86, 167; Rev. J. Keble, 134, 138, 142, 147, 191, 195, 208, 217, 222, 225, 244, 257, 259, 266, 299, 313, 328, 331, 334, 340, 349, 360, 368; a Layman, 185; Rev. Mr. McGhee, 192; Archdeacon Manning, 272, 292; Mrs. J. Mozley, 152; Bishop of Oxford, 42 *et seq.*, 262; Perceval, 393; Rev. E. B. Pusey, 383, 387; Rev. C. Russell, 122; Rev. A. St. John, 236, 242, 333; Rev. A. Tarbutt, 177; *The Times*, 109, (unpublished, 149); unknown correspondents, 176, 205, 268 *et seq.*; Mr. Walter, 148; Dr. Wiseman, 129 *et seq.*; Mr. S. F. Wood, 33 *et seq.*, 38, 61, 67, 146, 158, 174
- Library, 204, 334, 340, 344
- Sermons—effect of sermons at St. Mary's on the Oxford Movement, 28; explanatory letter *re* 'Secret Faults,' 62; 'Parochial Sermons,' 69; on 'Implicit and Explicit Reason,' 69; on Development, 245, 277; 'Subjects of the Day': correspondence with Keble, 246 *et seq.*, 263, 266, 302 *et seq.*; extracts from the Sermon on the 'Invisible Presence of Christ,' 252-3; Keble's criticism, 263; Manning's correspondence with Newman, 290; effect on a young lady, 300; friend of Keble notes new dogmatic note, 305, 308; the reference to 'our Lord eating and drinking,' 304, 307; extracts from 'Dangers to the Penitent,' 358; 'Indulgence in Religious Privileges,' 359
- Newman's father, 394
- Newman, Francis, 394
- Newton, Bishop, 51
- Newton, John, 111, 394
- New Zealand, Bishop of. *See* Selwyn, Rt. Rev. G. A.
- Nonconformists. *See* Dissenters
- Norris, the Common Room man, 194
- Novatians, 173, 260
- OAKELEY, Mr. Frederick, 159, 160, 174, 180, 197, 198, 227, 324, 357; on the precipitancy of the authorities concerning Tract XC, 72; letter to Pusey, 85; article on Jewel, 135; Newman and his aspirations for reunion with Rome, 198-9; translation of St. Bernard, 298, 306, 308; Bishop of London's action and his resignation, 365 *et seq.*, 373, 379; Newman suggests he should consider question of entering Roman Church: correspondence with J. R. Hope, 379
- Oath of Supremacy, Newman and, 227
- O'Connell, 132, 350
- Ogilvie, 325
- Oldcastle, John—monograph on Newman quoted, 390
- Ordination, Episcopal, 207
- Oret, 356
- 'Origen contra Celsum,' 197
- Ormsby, 228
- Orpah—reference in 'Sermons on Subjects of the Day': Manning and, 291-2
- Oxford, Bishop of. *See* Bagot, Dr.
- Oxford Movement, the—emergence of the new school of Tractarians, 27; effect of Newman's sermons at St. Mary's, 28; attitude of authorities towards followers of Newman and Pusey, 31; the controversy

- over Tract XC., 70-110; discontinuance of the Tracts, 99-102; Dr. Wiseman's attitude, 118; correspondence between Dr. Russell and Newman, 118, 129; Oakeley's article on Jewel marks parting of old and new school of Tractarians, 135; Newman's fear of movement to expel Tractarians from University: letter to Mrs. Mozley, 153; the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Cheltenham Evangelicals' address denouncing the Tracts, 169 *et seq.*; penitential spirit of the movement, 172; alleged league of Government and Bishops against, 184; Newman's letter to Bellasis on his difficult position, 184; letter to a layman on Catholic tendencies, 185; letter to Mr. J. R. Hope, 191; note to Pusey on Oakeley and Ward: the aspiration for reunion with Rome, 199; rise of the new school with Romanising tendencies, 239 *et seq.*; the secessions to Rome, 248-9, 250, 257; a Bishop's claim respecting Newman's dwindling adherents, 294; intensity of religious spirit, 358; Oakeley's fears as result of break-up in 1845, 368; Newman's obituary in the *Guardian* quoted, 390
- Anglican defections to Rome. *See under* Anglican Church.
- Evangelicals—difference in religious spirit, 112
- Tait's views, 95-6
- Oxford University:—
- Chancellorship question, 60-1
- Hebdomadal Board—attitude towards Tract XC, 71; proposals concerning W. G. Ward's 'Ideal of a Christian Church,' 94
- Poetry professorship, the election for, 134, 153, 159, 171
- Test, the proposed—The Hebdomadal Board's proposal, 94; Archibald Tait and, 94 *et seq.*; Newman confesses fears to Mrs. J. Mozley, 153
- Theological Statute—Newman advises Mr. Hope of the drafting of, 183
- Vice-Chancellor. *See* Wynter, Dr.
- PALGRAVE, Sir Francis, 283
- Palmer, R. (of Magdalen), 50, 51, 59, 81, 156, 189, 233, 242, 248; Protest against the Jerusalem Bishopric, 156; on Pusey's suspension, 242
- Palmer, Mr. Roundell. *See* Selborne, Lord
- Palmer, Rev. William (of Worcester)
- Treatise on the Church*, Newman's review of, 10; *View of Faith and Unity*, 12; appreciation of Tract XC, 76-7; proposed public Declaration, 105; and the Jerusalem Bishopric scheme, 147, 171, 217; and the services of the Tractarians, 169; pamphlet on the Tracts, 250, 252
- Parker, 164
- Pattison, Mark, 32, 39, 52, 228, 280, 313
- Pauli, Mr., 393
- Peel, Sir Robert, 140; Newman's letters to *The Times* on the Tamworth address, 142; the Maynooth grant, 375
- Penance, 172-3
- Perceval, Rev. A., 217, 266, 312; letter to Newman on Tract XC, 81; and the Jerusalem Bishopric scheme, 147; Newman's letter on Tract XC, 393
- Perrone, Father, 177
- Petavius on Eutyches, 2
- Peter the Tanner, 5
- Phantasaists, 5
- Phillipps, Mr. *See* Lisle
- Physis*, the term—attitude of the Monophysites, 6
- Pope—authority, infallibility, and supremacy: effect of Newman's studies of the Early Church, 7; not the point of divergence between England and Rome, 8, 11; reference in rough draft of letter to a friend, 22; Newman's note to Pusey, 198; letters to Keble, 218, 351; correspondence with Hope, 285, 287; Newman's certainty on the supremacy question, 351
- Prayers for the dead, 22, 308
- Predestination, 115, 116
- Pritchard, 228
- Prodigal Son, the Parable of the, 178
- Prophetic office, the, 12
- Proterius, Patriarch, 5
- Protestants and Protestantism—

- Newman's views as a result of study of Monophysite controversy, 1; Dr. Russell on danger of lapsing from Anglicanism, 129; references in Newman's letters on the Jerusalem Bishopric scheme, 145, 148, 150, 155, 171; Mr. Hope's letter to Mr. Gladstone, 157; Tractarians and the Reformers, 175 *et seq.*; Newman and Reformers, 177, 198; his letters to Badeley, 182, 327
- Protestant league, supposed plan for universal, 155
- Prussia, King of—the proposed address, 179 *et seq.*; prayers with Newgate prisoners, 181
- Prussian Church—question of relations with Anglican Church raised over Jerusalem Bishopric project, 143 *et seq.*, 151, 158
- Purgatory, Tract XC and, 76; Pusey on, 83; Newman's letter to a correspondent explaining passage in sermon on 'Secret Faults,' 62; the letter to Dr. Jelf, 167
- Pusey, Edward Bouverie, 102, 135, 139, 147, 170, 176, 195, 228, 257, 271, 280, 297, 301, 320, 324, 342, 369; authorities' attitude towards his disciples, 32; note to Bishop of Oxford *re* Bloxam, 45; proposed institution of Sisters of Mercy, 54; opposes Bishop of Salisbury for the Chancellorship, 61; criticises S. F. Wood's sketch, 67; on the precipitancy of the authorities regarding Tract XC, 71; letter to Dr. Wynter defending Tract XC, 81; letter to Newman on the letter to Dr. Jelf, 82; Bishop of Oxford's letter suggesting publication of explanations, 88; Newman's letter to *The Times* in 1863, 110; Newman's letter to Keble on state of health of Pusey's family, 141; attitude on the Jerusalem Bishopric, 143; consulted by Newman *re* Evangelical address denouncing the Tracts, 170; and the Martyrs' Memorial, 176; letter to the Archbishop, 185, 188; Newman's love for, 195; his note to Pusey on Oakeley and Ward's aspirations for reunion with Rome, 197-9; the reference in 'Loss and Gain,' 200; suggests Newman should retain Littlemore, 212; ill-health, 222, 229, 230, 237; Newman's account of his health to Rev. W. Dodsworth, 237; Keble advises Newman to consult him on changed opinions, 261; letter to Gladstone on Newman's correspondence with Manning, 279; and the 'Lives of the Saints,' 280, 282; and the Roman devotional system, 306-307; Newman's letter to Badeley on the significance of Pusey's suit, 344; view of Newman's intention to enter Roman Church, 382; Newman's letters to Pusey on the case of a young lady disposed to join Roman Church, 383; announcing resignation of fellowship, 387
- Baptism, Tract on, Newman and, 177
- Suspension for the sermon on the Eucharist, 204, 208, 228-9, 232 *et seq.*, 242; Newman's letter to Badeley, 327; Keble's suggestion as to his conduct on expiry, 347
- Pusey, Mrs., ill-health, 33
- Pusey, Lady Lucy, 141
- Pusey, Lucy, 230, 232

## QUIN, 87

- Rambler*, the essay in the, 12
- Rationalism, 150, 157
- Real Presence, doctrine of the, 139, 171, 240, 348
- Reason and belief, 23
- Reding, Charles, the character in 'Loss and Gain,' 29, 230
- Reformation and Reformers. *See* Protestants and Protestantism
- Religion, subjectiveness in, Newman on, 112, 114, 253
- Religious privileges, indulgence in—extracts from Newman's sermon, 359
- Repentance—the sermon on dangers to the penitent, 358
- Residence—Newman's letter to Mr. J. R. Hope, 190
- Review, Newman proposes to establish a, 287

- Richards, Dr., Rector of Exeter, and Tract XC, 78
- Ridley—advice to his father-in-law over Rev. P. Young, 140
- Rio's La Petite Chouanerie, the article on, 197
- Rivington, 228, 284-5, 290
- Rock, Dr., 40, 50
- Rogers, Frederic, 14, 34-5, 60, 220, 315; correspondence with Newman over changed religious views, 14, 220-1, 226; his defence of Newman in Convocation, 221; on Dr. Hawkins' attitude towards Tract XC, 387
- 'Roman Catholic Church'—Newman's recognition of its historical position, 6; Newman's correspondence with Keble: acknowledges Roman Church as the Church of the Apostles, 219; Keble's reply, 222; Newman explains his position to an unknown correspondent, 268; growing conviction that Roman communion is the true Church, 316; Newman's unfavourable view of present state of Roman Catholics, 364
- Anglican Church, differences with. *See* Anglican and Roman Churches, differences between Anglican secessions. *See under* Anglican Church
- Belief in her teaching as the teaching of God imperative—Newman's letter of Oct. 11, 1879, 31
- Catholicity—Dr. Russell's correspondence with Newman, 127; Manning's correspondence with Newman, 275 *et seq.*; Newman's correspondence with J. R. Hope, 281
- China, work in, 213
- Devotions, Dr. Russell on, 125
- Doctrine—Tract XC and, 72 *et seq.*; Pusey's suggestions to Newman respecting the letter to Dr. Jelf, 82; correspondence between Newman and Russell, 118-29; and Wiseman, 129-32; Newman's attitude in 1841-3, 166 *et seq.*
- Faith, alleged additions to the—Newman's accusation, 8; his doubts, 16, 21; Dr. Russell's correspondence with Newman, 129; Newman's changed views: correspondence with Keble, 219, 223
- Romish, the term—distinction from Tridentine, 73
- Rosary, Dr. Russell on the, 125
- Rule of Faith. *See* Faith, Rule of
- Russell, Dr. C., of Maynooth, 73, 111, 117, 168; biographical note, 117; and Tract XC, 73; correspondence with Newman respecting reference to Transubstantiation in Tract XC and Roman doctrine, 118-29
- Russia—mixed marriages question, 38
- Ryder, T., 228, 349
- SABELLIANISERS, 370
- Sacrament, the Blessed. *See* Eucharist
- St. Aldhelm, 283
- St. Alphonsus, sermons of, 168
- St. Athanasius, 21, 22, 24, 25, 26; Newman's work, 133, 140, 151, 158, 294, 300, 341
- St. Augustine, 13, 21, 197, 260
- St. Augustine of Canterbury, 283
- St. Bernard, 125; Oakeley's work, 298, 306, 308
- St. Cyprian, 21, 197, 260
- St. Cyril of Alexandria, Epistles of, 4, 6, 24
- St. David's, Bishop of, 211
- St. Flavian, Patriarch of Constantinople, 2
- St. Francis Xavier, 125
- St. Gregory—the address to St. Basil, 65
- St. Hilary, 22
- St. Ignatius the Martyr, 21, 147
- St. Ignatius of Loyola, 'Exercises,' 168, 296
- St. John—on Grace, 177
- St. John Baptist, 265
- St. John Chrysostom, extracts from, 121
- St. John, Rev. Ambrose—correspondence with Newman on his religious opinions, 236, 240; on death of Bowden, 334; and Newman's secession, 388
- St. Leo the Great, Pope, 2, 7, 14, 21, 24
- Tome. *See* Tome of St. Leo
- St. Mary's, Oxford:—  
Newman contemplates resignation, 204; correspondence with Keble, 208 *et seq.*, 215,



- 217, 222, 225, 231, 246, 248, 250, 252, 255, 257; letter to Mr. J. R. Hope, 259; Newman's letter of resignation, 262; subsequent correspondence with Keble, 266; correspondence with unknown correspondent, 268; with Manning, 271 *et seq.*
- St. Paul—on Grace, 177; unsettling effect on the Jewish Church, 301
- St. Philip Neri, Newman compared to, 117
- St. Stephen, 283, 285
- St. Vincent of Paul, 125
- Saints, intercession and invocation of, 65, 123-4, 171, 207; Tract XC and, 76; Newman and, 167; Rev. T. E. Morris's sermon on Laud, 228; distinction between intercession and invocation, 229; Newman's correspondence with Rev. Ambrose St. John, 240; with Rev. F. W. Faber, 356
- Salisbury, Bishop of—suggested for Chancellorship of Oxford University, 60-1; charge, 199
- Sancta Clara, 123
- Scepticism. *See* Doubt.
- Schleiermacher, 96
- 'Schoolfellow, an old'—letter to Newman on his reported intention to join Roman Church, 341
- Scotch Church, 194 *et seq.*
- Scott, Rev. Thomas, of Aston Sandford, 41; his influence on Newman, 111 *et seq.*
- 'Securus judicat orbis terrarum,' 13, 35
- Selborne, Lord (Mr. Roundell Palmer), 105, 205
- Selwyn, Right Rev. G. A., Bishop of New Zealand, 342
- Sermons. *See under* Newman, John Henry
- Sewell, Mr., of Exeter, 79
- Sewell, Mr., of Magdalen, 55, 230
- Sewell—criticism in *Dublin Review*, 87
- Short, 80
- Shuttleworth, Right Rev. P. N., Bishop of Chichester, 68, 184
- Sibthorpe, 149, 181, 186, 269; Rev. W. Dodsworth's controversy with, 181
- Sicily—Newman recalls experiences during visit; letter to Keble, 315
- Simony, canonical, 190
- Sin—character, 29; post-baptismal, 173, 206; forgiveness. *See* Forgiveness of sin
- Skinner, Mr., 214
- 'Smith,' the character ('Loss and Gain'), 200
- Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 324
- Society for Promoting Christianity among the Jews, 146
- Socinianism, 150
- Spencer, Mr., the R.C. priest, 50, 51, 55
- Spranger, 79
- Standard, The*; Newman suggests action against, 145, 159
- Stanley, 228
- State conscience—Newman's letter to Gladstone 375
- Stewart, 215
- Stillingfleet, 22
- Stowell, Rev. H., 309
- 'Stranger,' a—on Newman's reported secession to Roman Church, 341
- Symons, Dr.—attempted opposition to election as Vice-Chancellor, 328
- Synodites, 10
- TAIT, Archibald (future Archbishop of Canterbury)—and Tract XC, 77, 94; one of the four Senior Tutors, 94; his attitude towards the proposed Test at Oxford, 94
- Tarbutt, Rev. A.—Newman's letter on Grace, 177
- Taylor, Bishop Jeremy, Dr. Russell on his references to Transubstantiation, 120, 263
- Taylor, Mr., 49, 227
- Tertullian, 197
- Theodosius II, Emperor, 2, 3
- Theodosius, the monk, 5
- Thirlwall, Connop (Bishop of St. David's), 208, 366
- Thirty-nine Articles. *See* Anglican Church; Articles of Religion
- Tickell, 228
- Times, The*—and Tract XC; 80; Newman's letter (1863), 109; attitude towards the Tractarians, 141; attitude towards Jerusalem bishopric, 141; Newman's unpublished letter, 149
- Timothy the Cat, 5

- Todd, Dr. J. H.—Discourses on the Prophecy relating to anti-Christ, 50; letter to Newman on Tract XC, 91
- Tome of St. Leo (*Epistola Dogmatica ad Flavianum*), 3, 4
- Toovey, 288, 344
- Townshend, Mr., 214
- Tracts—the doctrinal side of the Oxford movement, 28; table of sales in Newman's letter to Bowden, 67; discontinuance, 99–102; spontaneous development: Newman's letter to correspondent, 205
- LXXI—extract referring to the controversy with the Roman Catholics, 28
- XC, 2, 70–106; apprehensions of the four Senior Tutors, 70; Newman's letter to Dr. Jelf in vindication, 71, 82; precipitate action of the authorities, 71; thesis of the Tract, 72; distinction between *Romish* and *Tridentine*, 73; relation to the idea of a Catholic Church, 74; critical principles summarised, 75; objects, 76; the controversy over, 76 *et seq.*; Pusey's suggestions, 82–4; Newman's note to Pusey's letter, 85; Dr. Hook's letter to Newman, 87; Bishop of Oxford suggests publication of explanations, 88–9; suppression proposed, 99; Newman's correspondence with Dr. Hook, 99; with Keble, 100; Newman's letter to Bishop of Oxford, 102; letter to *The Times* in 1863 repudiating Mr. Maurice's accusations, 109; correspondence with Dr. Russell, 118–29; Archbishop of Canterbury receives Cheltenham Evangelicals' address denouncing, 169; the Retraction of anti-Catholic Statements, 203; unanimous condemnation by Bishops, 211, 214; Keble upholds it as sufficiently Anglican, 231; Newman's explanation to Manning concerning his resignation of St. Mary's, 272; Newman's correspondence with Keble on Ward's 'Ideal,' 362 *et seq.*; the proposed censure by Convocation, 367; F. Rogers on Dr. Hawkins' attitude, 387; Newman's letter to Perceval, 393
- Tractarians. *See* Oxford Movement
- Tradition, 207
- Transubstantiation, 25; reference in Tract XC: correspondence between Dr. Russell and Newman, 118–29; between Rev. Ambrose St. John and Newman, 240
- Trent, Council of—Anglican objections considered, 22; Newman's correspondence with Dr. Wiseman, 131
- Decrees, Tract XC and, 73 *et seq.*
- Tridentine, the term—its distinction from Romish, 73
- Tridentines, 24
- Tutors, Four Senior—letter to Newman on Tract XC, 70, 76; identity, 93
- UNKNOWN correspondents—Newman's correspondence with: on the Reformers, 176; his position as regards Anglican and Roman Churches, 268
- VALDESSO, John, 256
- Veron's 'Regula Fidei,' 120, 123, 127
- Vigilius of Thapsus, Bishop, on the Monophysites, 6, 9
- Virgin Mary, reverence to the, 123, 124, 167
- WACKERBARTH, Mr., 186, 189
- Waddington, Dean, 214
- Wall on 'Infant Baptism,' 197
- Walter, Mr., of *The Times*—correspondence with Newman on the Jerusalem Bishopric, 141, 148
- Ward, Mr. W. G., of Balliol College, 14, 57; and Tract XC, 77; and the *British Critic*, 135; and Canons of 1603, 161; Newman's letter to Wood, 174; Newman's relations with, 197; Newman's note to Pusey on differences with the extreme Tractarians, 198; and the article on confession, 217, 222
- 'Ideal of a Christian Church,'—proposals of Hebdomadal

- Board concerning, 94; Tait and, 95; the authorities and, 325, 338, 344, 357, 360; incident with the Master over reading the lessons, 338; Newman's correspondence with Keble, 360 *et seq.*, 368 *et seq.*; the Test, 361 *et seq.*, 364-5; the 'Ideal' condemned and Ward deprived of University degrees, 367; Newman and Gladstone's article in the *Quarterly*, 368
- Ward, G. R. M., of Trinity College, 55-57, 58
- Watson, 126
- Wellington, Duke of, 55, 172
- Wesleyans, Newman on Anglican defections to, 185
- Whately, 351
- Wilberforce, Henry, 14, 35, 59, 241-2, 370; account of Newman's doubts in 1839, 14; and Ambrose St. John's difficulties, 241-2
- Wilberforce, Robert, 106, 144, 160; on Tract XC and Newman's letter to Bishop of Oxford, 106
- Wilberforce, Samuel, Archdeacon of Surrey—wife's death, 80; on Bunsen and the Jerusalem Bishopric scheme, 144, 171
- Williams, Isaac, 79, 331, 340; candidature for Poetry Professorship, 134, 153, 159, 171
- Williams, Robert, 34-5, 36, 38, 67, 161, 198, 306, 307, 360, 362, 370
- Wilson, 38, 137, 215, 299, 301, 349, 371; suggested collaboration with Mozley in editorship of *British Critic*, 137
- Wilson, Mr. (one of the Four Senior Tutors), 93
- Winchester, Bishop of—charge, 156
- Wiseman, Dr.—*Dublin Review*, article drawing parallel between Anglicans and Donatists, 13, 25; and Tract XC, 73; favourable attitude towards Tractarians, 118; correspondence with Newman on Anglican and Roman differences, 129-132; letter to Mr. Phillipps complaining of Newman's attitude towards O'Connell, 132
- Wood, Mr. S. F., 33; Newman's letters to, 33-4, 38, 61, 67; Pusey's criticism of his sketch, 68; Newman's correspondence on the Jerusalem Bishopric scheme, 146, 159; correcting account of his sermon, and touching on the subject of Rome, 160; advising him to remain in the Anglican Church, 174-5; death, 215, 222
- Wootten, Dr., 237, 326
- Wordsworth, 324
- Wynter, Dr., Vice-Chancellor, 36, 56, 71, 79, 81, 228, 234-5
- YOUNG, Rev. Peter, 134 *et seq.*, 231, 331, 349; Keble's differences with Bishop over refusal of priest's orders, 134, 136-7, 140
- ZENO, the Emperor, 5















